



This is a digital copy of a book that was preserved for generations on library shelves before it was carefully scanned by Google as part of a project to make the world's books discoverable online.

It has survived long enough for the copyright to expire and the book to enter the public domain. A public domain book is one that was never subject to copyright or whose legal copyright term has expired. Whether a book is in the public domain may vary country to country. Public domain books are our gateways to the past, representing a wealth of history, culture and knowledge that's often difficult to discover.

Marks, notations and other marginalia present in the original volume will appear in this file - a reminder of this book's long journey from the publisher to a library and finally to you.

Usage guidelines

Google is proud to partner with libraries to digitize public domain materials and make them widely accessible. Public domain books belong to the public and we are merely their custodians. Nevertheless, this work is expensive, so in order to keep providing this resource, we have taken steps to prevent abuse by commercial parties, including placing technical restrictions on automated querying.

We also ask that you:

- + *Make non-commercial use of the files* We designed Google Book Search for use by individuals, and we request that you use these files for personal, non-commercial purposes.
- + *Refrain from automated querying* Do not send automated queries of any sort to Google's system: If you are conducting research on machine translation, optical character recognition or other areas where access to a large amount of text is helpful, please contact us. We encourage the use of public domain materials for these purposes and may be able to help.
- + *Maintain attribution* The Google "watermark" you see on each file is essential for informing people about this project and helping them find additional materials through Google Book Search. Please do not remove it.
- + *Keep it legal* Whatever your use, remember that you are responsible for ensuring that what you are doing is legal. Do not assume that just because we believe a book is in the public domain for users in the United States, that the work is also in the public domain for users in other countries. Whether a book is still in copyright varies from country to country, and we can't offer guidance on whether any specific use of any specific book is allowed. Please do not assume that a book's appearance in Google Book Search means it can be used in any manner anywhere in the world. Copyright infringement liability can be quite severe.

About Google Book Search

Google's mission is to organize the world's information and to make it universally accessible and useful. Google Book Search helps readers discover the world's books while helping authors and publishers reach new audiences. You can search through the full text of this book on the web at <http://books.google.com/>





1

1

1



A
GENERAL VIEW
OF THE
DOCTRINE
OF
REGENERATION IN BAPTISM.

A
GENERAL VIEW
OF THE
DOCTRINE
OF
REGENERATION IN BAPTISM.

A
GENERAL VIEW
OF THE
DOCTRINE
OF
REGENERATION IN BAPTISM.

BY THE RIGHT REV.
CHRISTOPHER BETHELL, D.D.
LORD BISHOP OF BANGOR.

FOURTH EDITION, REVISED.

LONDON:
FRANCIS & JOHN RIVINGTON,
ST. PAUL'S CHURCH YARD, & WATERLOO PLACE.
1845.

LONDON :
GILBERT AND RIVINGTON, PRINTERS,
ST. JOHN'S SQUARE.



P R E F A C E

TO

THE FOURTH EDITION.

THE fourth edition of this work has been carefully revised, and some verbal alterations have been made in it. But in all material respects there is no difference between the text of this edition, and of that (the first) of 1822.

An Appendix has been subjoined, containing remarks on Mr. Faber's volume, published in 1839, which he entitles "The Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration."

Some additions have been made to the Notes, several of which refer likewise to Mr. Faber's Treatise. They will be found in pp. 6. 18. 20, 21. 30. 35. 45. 56. 89. 90. 92. 103. 127. 152. 158. 181.

I subjoin to this Preface a few remarks, which I had no opportunity of introducing into the Appendix.

Mr. Faber translates *καινὴ κτίσις*, (2 Cor. v. 17. Gal. vi. 15.) a new *creation*; and Mr. Arnold approves of this translation. I have no doubt that the translation in our authorized version is correct; a *new creature*.

For though, according to grammatical analogy *creation* may be the more proper meaning of *κτίσις*, yet in the New Testament, with the exception of one passage, Rom. i. 20. (where the sense is determined by the word which it governs; ἀπὸ κτίσεως κόσμου,) these are the only passages in which it does not unquestionably signify, not *the act of creating*, but *the things created*. It may reasonably be concluded, therefore, that it has the same meaning in these passages, and that *καινὴ κτίσις* is equivalent to *καινὸς ἄνθρωπος*, Eph. i. 24.

This is evidently the sense in which Chrysostom understood these passages. In his comment on 2 Cor. v. 17, he says, "If any one has believed, he is a new creature. For he, *i. e.* the believer, the new creature," has passed "through," or, "has arrived at another formation (*εἰς ἑτέραν ἦλθε δημιουργίαν*), for he has been born again of the Spirit."

In Gal. vi. 15, he explains the word by *καινὴ πολιτεία*, a new state, or new privileges of citizenship; a new manner of life.

In 2 Cor. v. 21, Mr. Faber's comment on the words ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἁμαρτίαν ἐποίησεν is, "he has made him a *sin-offering* for us." But he is, I conceive, mistaken

in this interpretation of the passage. Not to insist on Mr. Davison's remark, which I believe to be well-grounded, that the Hebrew word חַטָּאת, when used for a *sin-offering*, is rendered in the N. T. by *περὶ* or *ὑπὲρ ἁμαρτίας*, the parallelism of this passage leads us to its proper meaning. *He dealt with or treated him as a sinner for our sake, or on our behalf, that we might be treated as righteous in God's account in him.*

So Chrysostom explains the passage. "He suffered him to be condemned as a sinner, and to die as an accursed person. He made him who was righteous a sinner, that he might make us who were sinners, righteous. Nor is this all. For he does not say that he made him a sinner only, but sin itself, that we should be made not righteous merely, but righteousness, and God's righteousness. For this is God's righteousness, when we are justified not of works, but of grace, when all sin is abolished (or made to disappear) (*ἡφάνισται*). But this at once prevents us from being puffed up, since the whole is God's free gift, and instructs us in the greatness of the gift. For that former righteousness was the righteousness of the law and of works; but this is the righteousness of God."

Mr. Arnold finds fault, not without reason, with Mr. Faber, for speaking of the Evangelists and Apostles, and even of our Lord Himself, as *theologizing*, in the usual sense of that word. Mr. Faber

has probably met with this word (θεολογεῖ) predicated of the Evangelists and Apostles, perhaps of our Saviour Himself, by the Greek Fathers. But in these cases the word has a different import from that in which we use it. Theologizing, when so applied by them, means speaking of our Lord's Divine nature (Θεολογία) as it is opposed to the οἰκονομία, the dispensation of his incarnation or human nature.

In this sense, the word Θεολόγος is used in the title prefixed to the book of Revelations: Ἀποκάλυψις Ἰωάννου τοῦ Θεολόγου, "The Revelation (as it is translated in our version) of John the *Divine*." St. John is so called, because he has spoken of our Lord's divine nature more fully and more particularly than the other Evangelists.

P R E F A C E

TO

THE SECOND EDITION.

1836.

SOME years have now passed away, since I was informed by my late respectable publisher¹, that this treatise, published in 1822, was out of print, and was recommended by him to publish a second edition. It is needless to assign the reasons which have hitherto prevented me from acceding to this suggestion. It will be sufficient to say that the delay has not been occasioned by any change of opinion, or any intention of altering or modifying the doctrinal statements which I then submitted to the public.

In some of the numerous tracts which have issued of late years from the press, suggesting alterations in the Book of Common Prayer, the revision of the Baptismal Services, with a view to the exclusion of the opinions maintained in this work, has been

¹ Mr. C. Rivington.

strongly recommended. The Church of England, however, will not, I am persuaded, consent to erase from her formularies a doctrine which she has received as a Catholic verity, founded in God's word, held by the universal Church from the time of the Apostles till the days of Zuinglius and Calvin, and deliberately retained by the Leaders of her Reformation.

Of those who advocate the changes to which I am adverting, there are some who do not go the length of condemning this doctrine as unscriptural, or mischievous, but recommend this revision of our services on principles of conciliation and concession. Were this a question of words only, or of things indifferent and of little value, such a proposal might be a fair subject of inquiry and discussion. But if it relates to the very nature and efficacy of a Sacrament, and if the alterations suggested involve not merely the mode of stating a doctrine, but that doctrine itself, compromise and concession are inadmissible. If the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism is unscriptural, it ought to be abandoned without hesitation. If it is, as we are persuaded, the doctrine of Scripture, explained and illustrated by the history of the Church of Christ, we dare not expunge it from our service books, or our Articles of Religion, in deference to the opinion of those whom we believe to be in error.

Those objectors, who call for this revision of our

offices for the administration of Baptism, because they conceive the doctrine contained in them to be unscriptural, must be referred to the body of the following work. How justly it is liable to this objection, and with what show of reason it has been numbered among the errors and corruptions of Christianity, I must leave to my readers to determine.

I have lying before me an anonymous pamphlet² which presents a striking specimen of the prejudices against this doctrine into which men are often betrayed by the course of reading which they pursue, and the language which they hear from their instructors. I do not allude to this pamphlet on account of any importance which I attach to it, because the writer, though he throws out assertions with unflinching intrepidity, is evidently unacquainted both with the state of the question, and with the history of Theological opinion. I shall merely advert to a few passages of this book, as exhibiting a sample of prevailing errors, and of the manner in which gentlemen, who know nothing of the plainest facts of ecclesiastical history, think themselves qualified to censure our service book, and to reform the doctrines of our Church.

² Reasons for refusing to sign the Lay Address to the Archbishop of Canterbury, in a Letter to a Friend. Hatchard, 1834.

The writer, assuming the correctness of his own views of the nature of Regeneration, and of the meaning of the word in Scripture, very naturally comes to the conclusion, that the doctrine maintained by our Church is unsound and unscriptural; and proceeds to give what he imagines to be an historical account of this corruption of pure and primitive Christianity.

He attributes, for instance, the assertion of this doctrine by the Church of England to the compromising policy of Elizabeth and her counsellors³; who, as he informs us, in order to conciliate the Papists, were anxious to retain as much of Popery as they could in the construction of our Liturgy and Articles. In matters indifferent, it was a wise and just policy to retain those ancient and decent usages, to which the people had been accustomed. But the learned and pious Divines to whom the management of our Reformation was intrusted, while they retrenched with an unsparing hand the superstitious practices and unsound doctrines of Popery, did not renounce either the tenets or the usages of the Apostolic and universal Church, merely because they had been held, and in some cases, perhaps, perverted by the Church of Rome, in the days of its ascendancy. They were content to lop off excrescences and to remove corruptions,

³ Pp. 16 —20. 27. 54, 55.

without destroying the substance of primitive and Catholic doctrine.

Taking for granted that the doctrine of infant baptismal Regeneration is a Popish tenet bequeathed to us by the policy of Elizabeth, the author brings forward as a strong prejudice against it, and as a symptom of its papal origin, the fact that it places the spiritual condition of a human soul at the discretion of a fellow-creature⁴. But he seems to forget that this is in accordance with the state and circumstances of our common nature; that the spiritual, no less than the temporal, welfare of children is deeply involved in the care and faithfulness of those to whom they are intrusted: and that whenever a duty connected with the happiness of our fellow-creatures is imposed on such frail and sinful beings as we are, it may be, and too often is neglected, at the hazard of their best interests. But the Church of England does not put any harsh construction on the case of infants dying without Baptism. We hold, indeed, that children who are baptized, dying before they commit actual sin, are undoubtedly saved; but we do not hold that infants dying without baptism are undoubtedly damned: and though we do not venture to speak peremptorily of their condition, we leave them without despair or distrust in the hands of a merciful Saviour.

⁴ Page 27.

The writer of this Pamphlet, who seems to charge our Church, by implication, with holding the more rigid opinion, speaks upon this subject with his usual confidence and want of correct information. That infants dying unbaptized are not saved, is not, as he supposes, a Popish doctrine, but was the common opinion of the ancient Christians, long before the corruptions of Popery gained ground in the Church.

Inferring with good reason the necessity of Baptism to salvation, from the words of the institution, from John iii. 5, and from other passages of Scripture, they nevertheless made an exception, on principles of natural equity and charity, in behalf of those catechumens who suffered martyrdom for Christ's sake, and of those who before their death had expressed a resolution or a desire of receiving that sacrament. But, since infants could neither suffer, voluntarily at least, for Christ's sake, nor entertain a desire of Baptism, they did not extend this charitable limitation to their case, though they endeavoured to soften the harshness of this sentence, by representing their condition as a kind of middle state, subjecting them to no positive pain, but shutting them out from such privileges and blessings as are peculiar to the elect. This opinion was held in the Church of Rome at the time of the Reformation; and the schoolmen grafted upon it the fiction of a *limbus infantium*, a kind of border,

or outground, parted off from the place of torments, in which the souls of these infants are detained. In the first formularies of faith⁵, composed in the reign of Henry VIII., the necessity, in the strict sense, of Baptism was asserted. But that assertion was afterwards withdrawn; and though our Church has neither pronounced peremptorily upon the case, nor ceased to teach that Baptism is "generally necessary to salvation," her divines have always placed the charitable latitude of construction on the precepts which enjoin it. "For grace (as Hooker⁶ expresses their sentiments on this head) is not absolutely tied unto sacraments; and such is the lenity of God, that unto things impossible he bindeth no man." It was this judgment of charity which induced the compilers of the "Office for the Baptism of those of Riper Years," to qualify the conclusion drawn from John iii. 5, as to the necessity of Baptism, with the words *where it may be had*; on which the writer of the Pamphlet makes this edifying reflection⁷. "Had they" (the divines of Charles II.) "possessed either reflection or modesty, when they felt it necessary so to qualify our Saviour's words, in order to fit them to their own conjectural exposition of John iii. 5, they would

⁵ Formularies of Faith, Oxford, 1825. Comp. pp. xix. 7. 93. with p. 254.

⁶ Hooker's Eccl. Pol. b. vi. s. 60.

⁷ Page 66.

shrewdly have suspected that they misinterpreted or misapplied the text."

The writer appears to take for granted, as a matter too notorious to need any proof, that the metaphorical interpretation of the word *water*, in John iii. 5, was the sense uniformly received in the purer ages of Christianity⁸, and consequently that in those days this doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration was unknown to the Church of Christ. Having assumed

⁸ The metaphorical sense usually assigned to this passage is, "Except a man be born again of the Spirit, acting like water, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God." But in the opinion of the writer before us¹, "water" signifies Repentance, and "Spirit" faith; so that our Saviour's address to Nicodemus is equivalent to his call to "repent and believe the Gospel." In another place² he tells us that repentance and faith are sure signs of spiritual Regeneration; and infers from hence, that since our Catechism mentions repentance and faith as prerequisites for Baptism, it does not inculcate the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, and, consequently, is inconsistent with the offices for the administration of Baptism. He evidently does not understand that he is assuming the very point in debate. For they who think that the word "Regeneration" in its strict and Scriptural sense, denotes that peculiar grace which is bestowed in Baptism, do not look upon faith and repentance as signs of Regeneration, but as necessary qualifications, in adults, for receiving that grace. This is the doctrine of our Catechism, which teaches us that faith and repentance are required of persons to be baptized; but that the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism is "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness: for being by nature born in sin, and children of wrath, we are hereby (i. e. by baptism) made the children of grace."

¹ Pp. 39, 40.

² Page 38.

this point, he proceeds to inform us, that what he elsewhere calls the conjectural exposition of the divines who compiled our "Office for the administration of Baptism to such as are of riper years," was a device of the Papists to magnify the virtue of a sacrament. "The Papists," he tells us, "always anxious to magnify a church ordinance, thought proper, upon a bold misconstruction of John iii. 5, to declare the ceremony of baptizing infants to be salvation, if they died before actual sin; and, calculating boldly upon the ignorance of the laity, supported their dogma by texts which are referrible only to the Baptism of proselytes⁹." "They hoped¹ to add to the attraction of their communion by raising a rite, highly proper in itself, to the unjustifiable pretension of a saving ordinance; and for that purpose understood the word *water*, John iii. 5, in its literal sense, and insisted that the kingdom of God meant the kingdom of glory²." "To sus-

⁹ Page 41.

¹ Page 42.

² The ancients maintained that the kingdom of God in these texts of Scripture³ signifies the *kingdom of glory*, because it cannot be affirmed with truth that no man can *see the kingdom of God in this world*, "except he be born again." But I do not think that there is much force in this reasoning, because the word "see" may be taken, without any violence to the common usage of language, in a metaphorical sense. But the notion that to "see" or "enter into the kingdom of God," signifies "to become a member of the visible Church, is a very inadequate

³ John iii. 3. 5.

tain this dogma of baptismal salvation ³, the Papists were driven to assert, that the injunction in St. Matthew to teach the Christian faith and to administer the Baptism of proselytism ⁴ to them that received it, was not the application of an old rite to a new faith, but that it was the institution of a new Baptism, foretold and described by our Lord in his conversation with Nicodemus. It did not suit the Papists to recollect that 'water' was frequently used, not instrumentally but symbolically, to signify purification or repentance; and that in representation of our Saviour's language. If the phrase "the kingdom of God" includes, as it well may, the state of grace, as well as the state of glory, to "see" "or enter" into it, manifestly means to be made partakers of the peculiar privileges, blessings, hopes, and promises of the Gospel kingdom.

The writer, while he contends that to be "born of water and of the Spirit" signifies to repent and believe, at the same time tells us that "the kingdom of God" signifies the visible Church. But that none but sincere penitents and true believers, none, in short, but those who are called, in a common and familiar way of speaking, "truly regenerate," can enter into the visible Church, is probably more than he intended to affirm.

³ Page 42.

⁴ The writer seems to look upon Baptism as nothing more than the continuance of a Jewish rite; a simple ceremony of initiation into the visible Church. But he cannot expect that the Church of England will change her views and definitions in deference to his opinion, or forget that her Lord, when he adopted a form of initiation not unknown to his countrymen, "added," as Bishop Taylor expresses himself, "the Spirit to the water, and made it a Sacrament or saving ordinance." "Our Saviour Christ altered and changed the same (the Jewish washings) into a profitable Sacrament."—Homily on Fasting.

some cases, (John iv. 14; vii. 37, 8, 9.) the word occurs without any reference to natural water at all, even as a symbol. The Papists also omit to notice, that there is an inward new birth, (1 Pet. i. 23.) wholly unconnected with water or any outward ceremonial."

It is not my intention to follow this writer through the reasonings and illustrations by which he has undertaken to prove that his own notions on this question are sound and scriptural, and that the doctrine of the Church of England is "flat Popery." I refer, as I have already stated, to this Pamphlet, only because it exhibits a specimen of popular and current errors, and of the hardihood with which men, in their eagerness to condemn opinions which they have been accustomed to look upon with suspicion and dislike, substitute conjecture and imagination for facts and history.

A learned divine, whose statements are not built upon hypothesis or fancy, but on a laborious examination of the writings of the ancient Christians, might have taught the writer, "that all the ancient Christians, not one excepted, do take the word 'Regeneration,' or new birth, to signify Baptism, and 'regenerate,' baptized; and that our Saviour's words to Nicodemus do so stand in the original, and are so understood by all the ancients, as to exclude unbaptized persons from the kingdom of heaven. And that by 'the kingdom of God' there is meant

the kingdom of glory, is proved from the plain words of the context, and from the sense of all ancient interpreters ⁵."

"All the ancient Christians ⁶ do understand that rule of our Saviour ⁷ (John iii. 5) of Baptism : I be-

⁵ Wall on Infant Baptism, vol. ii. p. 451, 3d Edit.

⁶ Wall, vol. ii. p. 260, 3d Edit.

⁷ The author intimates that the Papists, in order to give countenance to the literal interpretation of the word "water," (John iii. 5.) perverted another passage of Scripture by explaining "fire" (Matt. iii. 11) of the cloven tongues which sat on the disciples in the day of Pentecost.

The fact is, that when Calvin and his followers gave a metaphorical sense to the word "water," they adduced the Baptist's words in proof of the validity of their interpretation, affirming that as the one passage undoubtedly means *spiritus igneus*, so the other must mean *spiritus aqueus*. But it was replied, that this was to support one gratuitous assumption by another. Thus Hooker (Eccl. Pol. b. v. s. 59.): "By water and Spirit we are to understand in this place (as they imagine) no more than if the Spirit alone had been mentioned, and water not spoken of. Which they think is plain, because elsewhere it is not improbable, that *the Holy Ghost and fire* do but signify the Holy Ghost in operation resembling fire. Whereupon they conclude, that seeing "fire" in one place *may be*, therefore "water" in another place *is* but a metaphor—Spirit the interpretation thereof; and so the words do only mean, that *unless a man be born again of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God*. "Must we needs, at the only show of a critical conceit, utterly condemn them of error, which will not admit that 'fire' in the words of John is quenched with the name of the Holy Ghost, or with the name of the Spirit 'water' dried up in the words of Christ?"

The ancients were of opinion that these words contain a propheticall allusion to the cloven tongues. They did not however confine the word to that occurrence, but supposed that it denoted

lieve Calvin to have been the first who ever denied this place to mean Baptism. He gives another those effects of the Spirit's agency, of which the cloven tongues were the signs or symbols. They considered them, therefore, as a prophecy of the influence of the Spirit, consigned to the Church through our Lord's baptism, and of the powerful working and effects of that influence⁴.

There is something specious in the explanation of Matt. iii. 11, which supposes that the Baptist in the words *he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire*, is speaking of two classes or persons, one of which, corresponding with the "wheat," (v. 12.) was to be baptized with the Holy Ghost; the other, corresponding with the chaff, was to be baptized with fire, *i. e.* the fire of calamity and destruction. But the structure of the sentence shows that, whatever may be the full meaning of the word "fire," the Baptism intended could be one only, and that the same persons were to be baptized both with the Holy Ghost and with fire. There is no force in the Author's remark, that the word "you" means only the by-standers, and therefore cannot denote those on whom the Holy Ghost fell on the day of Pentecost. The words are prophetic, extending to every age of the Christian Church.

The writer⁵ finds fault with the phrase used in our Liturgy, "the laver of Regeneration in Baptism." He tells us that the word "laver" does not signify washing, but the vessel in which the water is contained; and that therefore in this passage "the instrument of Regeneration, as it is called by some of our divines, is not water but stone." He does not appear to be aware that the word "laver" (*lavacrum*) or "bath," as Hooker renders it, corresponds precisely with the word of the original (*λουτρόν*, Tit. iii. 5.) and is capable of being taken in the same latitude. That word signifies either the place of bathing, or the water contained

⁴ See Scriptural View, Note A. p. 209.

τῇ ἐπεξηγήσει τοῦ πυρὸς τὸ σφοδρὸν καὶ ἀκάθεκτον τῆς χάριτος ἐνδεικνύμενος.—*Chrys. Homil. ii. in Matthæum.*

⁵ Page 65.

interpretation, (Inst. l. 4. c. xvi. s. 35.) which he confesses to be new."

After quoting a passage from Justin Martyr, in which to be born again signifies to be baptized, he states his own reasons for adducing it⁸:—

"Because it shows that the Christians in those days used the word 'Regeneration' for Baptism, and that they were taught to do so by the apostles. And it will appear, by the multitude of places which I shall produce, that they used it customarily, and applied it as much to signify Baptism, as we do the word 'christening.' Because we see by it that they understood that rule of our Saviour, (John iii. 5.) of water Baptism, and concluded from it that without such Baptism no man could come to Heaven."

So likewise Hooker⁹: "To hide the general consent of antiquity agreeing in the literal interpretation, they (Cartwright, &c.) cunningly affirm that *certain* have taken these words as meant of material water, when they know that of all the ancients *there is not one* to be named, that ever did otherwise expound or allege the place, than as implying external Baptism."

in it, or the act of washing. In this passage it certainly does not mean, as this gentleman humorously supposes, "the stone font," but either the water with which the child is baptized, or the act of washing or baptizing.

⁸ Wall, vol. i. p. 22.

⁹ Eccl. Pol. b. v. s. 59.

These quotations from authors of unquestionable accuracy and authority, will suffice to show how little acquainted the writer is with the history of the interpretation of John iii. 5. which he arraigns as a papistical contrivance, and a corrupt innovation on the pure and primitive doctrine of Christianity.

In another part of his Pamphlet¹ he informs us that transubstantiation and baptismal salvation, which he classes together as branches of the same corrupt doctrine, are "the two great subjects of dispute between Protestants and [Roman] Catholics."

But the truth is, that the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration or salvation, though it has been called in question by those Protestant Churches (usually called the Reformed Churches) which have adopted the sentiments of Zuinglius and Calvin, and their off-shoots, the Arminians and Socinians, is the doctrine not of the Church of Rome only, and of all the Eastern Churches, but of the Protestant Lutheran Churches, and the Protestant Church of England and Ireland. In common with the Church of Rome and the Lutheran Churches, we hold that Regeneration or the new birth is the spiritual grace of Baptism, conveyed over to the soul in the due administration of that sacrament. We hold, in common with those Churches, that in adults duly qualified by repentance and faith, the guilt of sin, both original and

¹ Page 54.

actual, is cancelled in Baptism; that in infants, who have committed no actual or wilful sin, and can possess no such qualifications, the guilt of original sin is done away; and that infants, no less than adults, are made in Baptism children of God, members of Christ, inheritors of the kingdom of heaven, and partakers of the privileges, and blessings, and promises of the Gospel covenant. ² But the Church of Rome contends that not only the guilt, but the very essence and being of original sin is removed

² Si quis per Jesu Christi Domini nostri gratiam, quæ in Baptismate confertur, reatum peccati originalis remitti negat, aut etiam asserit non tolli totum id, quod veram et propriam peccati vim habet, sed illud dicit tantum radi aut non imputari, anathema sit. In renatis enim nihil odit Deus, quia nihil in iis est damnationis, qui verè consepulti sunt cum Christo per Baptisma in mortem, qui non secundum carnem ambulant, sed veterem hominem exuentes, et novum, qui secundum Deum creatus est, induentes, puri, innoxii, ac Deo dilecti effecti sunt, hæredes quidem Dei, cohæredes autem Christi, ita ut nihil prorsus eos ab ingressu cœli remoretur. Manere autem in baptizatis concupiscentiam vel fomitem, hæc sancta Synodus fatetur et sentit, quæ cum ad agonem relicta sit, nocere non consentientibus, et viriliter per Christi Jesu gratiam repugnantibus non valet; quinimò qui legitimè ⁶ certaverit, coronabitur. Hanc concupiscentiam, quam aliquando Apostolus ⁷ peccatum appellat, Sancta Synodus declarat Ecclesiam Catholicam nunquam intellexisse peccatum appellari, quod verè et propriè in renatis peccatum sit, sed quia ex peccato est, et ad peccatum inclinat. Si quis autem contrarium senserit, anathema sit.—Canones et decreta Concilii Tridentini, sessio quinta.—Cat. Conc. Trid. pars ii. c. 2. 43.

⁶ 2 Tim. ii. 5.

⁷ Rom. vii. 7. 13.

by Baptism; the Church of England declares that "this corruption of nature remains even in the regenerate." The Church of Rome has decreed that that "concupiscence [or fuel (*fomes*) as it is called] which remains after Baptism has not, properly speaking, the nature of sin; whereas we affirm that "concupiscence has the nature of sin," and allege the authority of an apostle in support of our opinion. We believe that sacraments are not only signs of grace, but means or instruments through which God consigns over to the soul the grace which they signify. The followers of Zuinglius and Calvin, with whom the author of this Pamphlet agrees, contend that this is the very error of the *opus operatum*—the opinion, that is, that where there is no positive bar, sacraments produce a saving effect without suitable affections on the part of the recipient. We however affirm, as a general truth, that such affections of mind are indispensable, and that where they are wanting, sacraments produce no beneficial effects. But, as we are convinced that the Baptism of infants is a part of our Saviour's institution, we do not conceive that, in their case, the unavoidable want of these qualifications is any impediment to the saving grace of the sacrament.

The writer of this Pamphlet, however, after finding fault with the interrogatories tendered to, and the answers given by the sureties, in behalf of infants, says, that "the declaration that they have

become 'regenerate,' however suited to the compromising policy of Elizabeth, who wished to conciliate the Romanists, has opened a wide door for disunion and controversy in the present day, when, instead of looking to the authority of the Church as conclusive, men think for themselves, and refer to their Bibles³." That "the laity see that the clergy are divided on the subject of Infant Baptismal Regeneration, and are indignant when, instead of texts, they are furnished with tracts replete with arguments borrowed from the Church of Rome, and presenting specimens of logical deduction, which would be disgraceful even to children⁴;" that "when our Church repudiated the *opus operatum* of the Papists, it ought to have expunged the word 'regenerated,' which properly belongs to it, instead of suffering the expression to remain in its baptismal service and cause disunion among our clergy—some of them writing and speaking as if they secretly believed in the *opus operatum*, and others straining every nerve to show that 'Regeneration' does not mean Regeneration; by which, after all, they only prove that the word ought to be changed⁵."

It is deeply to be regretted that differences of opinion should exist on the subject before us between members of our communion, whether of the laity or of the clergy; and we fully recognize the

³ P. 58.

⁴ Pp. 68, 69.

⁵ Pp. 76, 77.

right of all Christians to "think for themselves, and to refer to their Bibles." But we would remind the author, that the meaning and drift of certain passages of Scripture are the hinge on which this controversy turns; and we may be allowed to doubt whether he, and the guides whom he follows, are the best expositors of these passages. We may be permitted at least, till we are better informed, to adhere to that interpretation of them which the Church of England, treading in the steps of all Christian antiquity, has adopted and made her own. We are persuaded that the more the doctrine and polity of our Church are examined and sifted, the more they will be approved by fair and unprejudiced enquirers. But we cannot undertake to reform and remodel our Liturgy in deference to the suggestions of men, however excellent and exemplary, who have departed, as we conceive, in this instance, from the form of sound words delivered down to us by our forefathers, and have embraced the opinions of another school of theology.

Whilst I was revising this work, and preparing it for the press, I was favoured with a copy of Mr. Professor Pusey's "Scriptural views of Baptism." It is highly satisfactory to me to find the views which I had long ago taken of this part of my subject, confirmed by an author not less distinguished

by laborious research, and an extensive acquaintance with Christian antiquity, than by the vein of piety and high Christian feeling, which pervades his Treatise. There are, however, points in which there is an apparent difference between my statements and those of the learned Professor, in regard to which, after due consideration, I cannot alter the language which I have employed, nor retract the opinions which I have espoused.

The Professor very justly observes, that "our Saviour's words (John iii. 5.) refuse to be bound down to any mere outward change of state or circumstances or relation, however glorious the privileges of that new condition may be⁶." They who deny the connexion between Baptism and Regeneration, look upon the sacrament as no more than an act of initiation into the visible Church, implying a change of outward state and circumstances only; but they put no such construction as that adverted to on our Saviour's words. But, without pretending to know who the persons are whose opinions are alluded to, or whether the remark is meant to include Waterland, I still think that the statement which I have borrowed from that eminent Divine, who speaks of Regeneration as a change not "of *outward* but of *spiritual* state, circumstances, and relations," supplies a safer and truer account of the

⁶ Scriptural View, p. 18.

grace conferred in Baptism, than any definition or representation of this grace which may seem to identify it with conversion, repentance, faith, or any of those Christian virtues or holy habits which are the fruits and evidences of the Spirit's influence. The Church of Rome⁷, indeed, affirms that "the grace bestowed in Baptism is not only that grace by which the remission of sin is effected, but a divine quality inhering in the soul; a kind of brightness and light, which not only effaces all the stains of our souls, but renders them more beautiful and shining; and that to this grace is added a most noble company of all virtues, which is poured into the soul by God." The Calvinistic divines accommodated this description of regenerating grace to their own views of Regeneration. It would appear too, from some passages of the Professor's Treatise, that he himself has no strong objections to the notion of such a change being effected in the souls of infants by the regenerating grace of Baptism. But, to my mind, such statements as these seem to

⁷ Est autem gratia (*i. e.* gratia baptismatis) quemadmodum Tridentina synodus ab omnibus credendum pœnâ anathematis propositâ decrevit, non solum per quam peccatorum sit remissio, sed divina qualitas in animâ inhærens, et veluti splendor quidam et lux, quæ animarum nostrarum maculas omnes delet, ipsasque animas pulchriores et splendidiore reddit. Huic autem additur nobilissimus virtutum omnium comitatus, quæ in animam cum gratiâ divinitus infunduntur.—Cat. Conc. Trid. pars ii. s. 50, 51. Syn. Trid. s. vi. c. 7.

depend rather on imagination and hypothesis, than on Scriptural authority or just reasoning. A translation from a natural state in Adam to a spiritual state in Christ, the forgiveness of sin, adoption, a covenanted title to everlasting happiness, and a new principle of spiritual life consigned over to the soul by a mysterious operation of the Holy Ghost, which we can neither describe in words nor discern by its effects, are the chief particulars which we include in the grace of Regeneration, and which we think are spoken of with much propriety as a change not of *outward* but of *inward and spiritual* state, circumstances, and relations. But though that principle of life contains the germ of those graces which are the ordinary fruits of the Holy Ghost, we do not conceive that any actual development of them, or any conscious conversion of the heart to God, takes place at that time in the souls of infants.

In support of the account of Regeneration which I have adopted from Waterland, I would observe, as has been remarked in the body of the work, that this notion of a change of *spiritual* state appears to agree better with the analogy on which the metaphor of "a new birth" is founded, than that of a change of affections and inward feelings, or of a creation or infusion of particular moral habits or virtues. For as the *natural birth* is a change of state and circumstances, and relation to outward things, so is the *spiritual birth*, or entrance into a

spiritual life, a change of state and circumstances, and relations to God and another world.

Again; it is admitted I believe by all who hold this doctrine, that the grace bestowed in Baptism is one simple act of the Holy Ghost; that "even in this kind" (*i. e.* the participation of infused grace) "the first beginning of life, the seed of God, the first-fruits of the Spirit, are without latitude⁸;" are bestowed equally on all, without degrees or variety. But we cannot conceive of repentance, or faith, or any of those religious graces which are often identified with Regeneration, as existing otherwise than with latitude. They are dispositions or habits of mind which necessarily imply in different subjects different degrees of strength and weakness, progressive improvement or gradual decay. On the other hand, such a change of spiritual state and circumstances as we suppose to take place in Baptism, is a simple simultaneous act, which cannot be better illustrated than in the language of Hooker, when arguing against the iteration of Baptism. "For how should we practise iteration of Baptism, and yet teach that we are by Baptism born anew; that by Baptism we are admitted into the heavenly society of saints; that those things be really and effectually done by Baptism which are no more possible to be often done, than a man can

⁸ Hooker's Eccl. Pol. l. v. s. 56.

naturally be often born, or civilly be often adopted into one stock or family? As Christ hath therefore died and rose from the dead but once, so that sacrament which both extinguisheth in him our former sin, and beginneth in us a new *condition* of life, is by one only actual administration for ever available⁹.”

But, in addition to these reasons for adhering to my former statement, conversion of the heart to God, faith, hope, charity, repentance, necessarily suppose some knowledge of God, and, by consequence, instruction of some kind or other in the truths of religion. But we know that infants are incapable of receiving such instruction; we observe in them no traces or symptoms of such knowledge, and have no reason to believe that it is miraculously communicated to them. We conclude, therefore, that since they are incapable of those habits and affections of mind which necessarily presuppose some knowledge of God, such habits and affections do not constitute the spiritual and inward grace of Baptism. In the case of adults, indeed, it is allowed that these good qualities or habits, which Waterland classes under the head of renovation, however they may be strengthened and confirmed by the grace conferred in Baptism, must precede that sacrament as qualifications for its due and saving reception;

⁹ Eccl. Pol. l. v. s. 62.

and consequently, as we contend, must precede their Regeneration.

For these reasons, without positively saying that that description of Regeneration which I have espoused and attempted to illustrate in several parts of the following work, has fallen under the Professor's animadversion, I must retain my former statements of this matter. It is but just to observe, that I have no reason to conclude from the Professor's writings, that he has any acquaintance with my work upon this subject.

There is another point on which my opinion differs from that of the Professor, and where I am not, I confess, convinced that I have been mistaken.

In his remarks on 1 John iii. 9¹, the learned Professor finds fault with the comment of many able and judicious divines on this passage². He doth not

¹ Pp. 166—171.

² Hammond, Grotius, Whitby, Doddridge, Rosenmüller, qualify the passage in this manner.

Gataker (Adv. Misc. c. 33.) has a dissertation on this passage, in which he examines and sets aside several expositions of it. He states that it does not speak of the duty of the regenerate (*i. e.* of what he *ought* to do), but of his purpose and practice. That it does not speak of the Regeneration of a future life; nor of any peculiar kind of sin, nor of sin, although committed being covered by charity or not imputed; but of the manner of sinning: "He does not sin in the same way as the unregenerate."

1. Ante peccandum non peccat, quia non vult peccare.

[2. Inter

commit sin³; he cannot sin; *i. e.* “he is not guilty of deliberate or habitual sin;” “he does not give his mind to sin, nor addict himself to the practice of it; he cannot be living in a habit of sin.” He considers these to be “qualifying expressions, clearly tampering with the word of God, and lowering his teaching.” But, with all due respect for the feelings of reverence for Scripture, which have led him to hazard this remark, I cannot acknowledge the justice of the censure, nor renounce the exposition which I have adopted. It is agreed on all hands, that some qualification or limitation of the Apostle’s language is necessary, because Scripture teaches us that “there is no man that sinneth not,” and that “if we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us;” and because we know by experience that the best and holiest of God’s children are not free from failings and sins. We find, however, in every part

2. *Inter peccandum non peccat, quia non totus peccat: in quantum renatus est non peccat.*

3. *In peccato, sive in peccati praxi non peccat, quia non dat operam peccato.*

4. *Post peccatum non peccat, quia non in peccato cubat.*

He sums up his explanation of the passage in the following words:—

Vitam peccato immunem, quantum potest, sibi proponit, nec peccato unquam sponte dat operam. Quòd si quandò præter animi propositum deliquerit, nec in peccatum totus proruit, nec in eodem persistit, sed errore agnito, ad institutum mox pristinum quàm primùm quantumque potest revertitur.

³ *ἀμαρτίαν οὐ ποιεῖ, οὐ δύναται ἀμαρτάνειν.*

of Scripture a comparison or contrast drawn between the just and righteous, and the wicked ; which amounts in fact to the same thing as the comparison drawn by St. John in this and the foregoing verses ⁴ between those who sin and those who sin not ; between those who do righteousness and those who commit sin. But it was not the intention of the inspired writers to describe God's children or saints as *perfectly* righteous and sinless. They evidently speak of the general tone of their conduct and conversation, of the bias of their minds, and of the predominance of their religious feelings and habits. It is with the same limitation that St. John teaches us that "whosoever hath been born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him ; and he cannot sin, because he hath been born of God ⁵." And this limitation cannot, in my opinion, be expressed more correctly or more modestly, than by saying, that the child of God "does not give his mind to sin, or addict himself to the practice of it ;" or, in other words, "is not guilty of deliberate or habitual sin." I entirely agree with the view which the Professor takes of the drift and purport of this passage, in his eloquent and impressive expansion of the concise account of it given by Waterland. But in what respect the limitation of its sense,

⁴ 1 John iii. 6—8.

⁵ See Chapter V. of the following work, where these passages are more fully explained.

which he has taken from Augustine—that “we cannot commit sin as far as, or inasmuch as, we are the sons of God”—is less liable than the other to the charge of “tampering with God’s word and lowering its meaning⁶,” I am at a loss to dis-

⁶ Chrysostom, quoted by Theophylact in locum, gives the same explanation of the passage.

“As often as we sin, we are born of the devil. On the other hand, we are born of God as often as we act virtuously, because his seed abides in us, that is to say, his Spirit, which we receive through Baptism, which, while it abides in us, does not allow the mind to give admission to sin. But, except a man is born of God, he does not receive the Holy Ghost.”

I cannot, however, subscribe to the interpretation given to the text by these eminent fathers ; for I cannot bring myself to think that the Apostle contemplates the same individual as being at once the child of God in one respect, and the child of the devil in another. Whereas, if both texts,—*He that committeth sin, is of the devil. Whosoever is born of God, doth not commit sin* ;—are understood as speaking of the purpose, disposition, bias of mind, and habits ; the limitation of the words seems to be reasonable and natural, and liable to no solid objections.

There is a passage quoted from Augustine, in the 9th chapter of this work, which, though not written with a view to this question, appears to me, to give a satisfactory answer to the inquiry, how he who is born of God is righteous, or does not commit sin, without contradicting the Apostle’s assertion, 1 John i. 8—10.

“Justification is conferred on us in this life, in three several ways. First, through the laver of Regeneration, in which all sins are forgiven. Then, by the contest which we are carrying on with those sinful dispositions, from the guilt of which we have been already absolved. Thirdly, when our prayer is heard, in which we say, *Forgive us our debts*. . . . Since,

cover. It appears to me that both these qualifications of St. John's expressions coincide in meaning,

with whatever fortitude we may wage war with these vicious inclinations, we are still men. But, while we continue in this corruptible flesh, God's grace assists us in our conflict in such a manner, that there will never be wanting occasions for his hearing us when suing for pardon."—*Contra Julianum*, l. i.

To the same effect is another passage in his Addresses to the Catechumens.

"When you have been baptized, hold fast to a good life, in obedience to God's commandments, that you may keep your Baptism (i. e. baptismal grace) in safe custody. I do not tell you that it is possible for you to live here without sin: but there are some pardonable sins from which that life (i. e. that good life) is not exempt.

"Baptism was instituted for a remedy of all sins; prayer, for the case of those lighter trespasses from which we cannot be free. We are washed once in Baptism; we are washed by prayer every day. But beware of committing those sins for which you may be separated from the body of Christ. Far be this from you! For if those whom you see doing penance (i. e. the *pœnitentes*) have been guilty of crimes, or adulteries, or other deeds of great enormity, it is on this account that they do penance. For if their offences had been light, their daily prayers would have been sufficient to blot them out."

These passages appear to me to furnish a clue to a more satisfactory explanation of these texts, and a plainer method of reconciling them to one another, than those adopted by Dr. Pusey; or than Augustine's own mode of solving the difficulty; for he supposes that the sin which God's children cannot commit is one particular sin, (*viz.*) the want of love or charity.—*See Tractatus in 1 Joh.* iii. 9.

The conclusion to which these passages of Augustine lead us, that the child of God may be said not to commit, nor to incur the guilt of sin, when, after his sins have been forgiven in Bap-

and that neither the one nor the other is justly exposed to the censure of being a departure from the rules of sober and reverential interpretation. But I prefer the explanation of the passage which I have given to that of the learned Professor, because it is more simple and intelligible, and more in accordance with the ordinary language of holy Scripture.

In my Preface to the First Edition, (the larger part of which, being principally occupied with topics and allusions of a temporary nature, I have not thought it necessary to republish,) I took notice of certain objections to the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, similar in some respects to those which I have been now examining. I animadverted on the extraordinary assertion of a respectable writer, who had affirmed that in the opinion of those who maintain this doctrine⁷, “the change which takes place in Baptism is the whole of that renovation which the soul requires.”

I stated likewise, that no divine of the Church of England has maintained that God’s grace is so

tism, he is contending strenuously against sin, and asking forgiveness of his daily trespasses and omissions, is equivalent to the solution proposed by those Divines, whose opinion is acceded to in this work.

⁷ Letter to a serious Inquirer after Divine Truth. By the late Rev. Edward Cooper.

limited to his ordinances, that it is impossible to enter into the kingdom of heaven, and to inherit eternal life without Baptism; or that adults, baptized in unbelief and impenitence, derive any immediate benefit from this sacrament; and that they who hold that Regeneration, strictly speaking, is the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism, do not identify it, as has been sometimes erroneously contended, with repentance, conversion, the renewal of the whole inward frame, an entire change of mind, or radical change in all the parts and faculties of the soul. On these points, however, I shall have occasion to speak more at large in the body of the Treatise. In fact, the real questions in debate are, whether, according to the doctrine of Scripture and the Church of England ⁸, Regeneration, in the strict sense of the word, is or is not the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism? whether the word can *properly* be applied to any other change not considered in conjunction with Baptism? and what is the nature of that change which the word *Regeneration* denotes ⁹?

⁸ It should be recollected that in the discussions which led the Author to undertake this work, the sense of the Church of England on this subject was the chief matter of debate.

⁹ It has been said, that the controversy on this subject does not relate to the nature of the change, but to the time of the occurrence. But in fact there can be no controversy on this subject, where the nature of the change, denoted by the word "Regeneration," does not form one of the principal hinges of

In the work now submitted to the public, my intention is to take a larger and more comprehensive view of the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, than has hitherto fallen in my way. After premising some remarks on the obvious advantages of adhering as much as possible to the strict and determinate usage of words in theological controversies and inquiries ¹, I shall lay before my readers a statement of the opinions of the ancient Christians on the subject of Regeneration ², and of the principles on which their usage of the word seems to depend ³. After this, I shall set forth the Scriptural grounds on which this doctrine of Regeneration is founded ⁴, and examine the Scriptural objections which have been taken to it ⁵. I shall then point out the strict conformity between the views of the ancient Christians and our own Church on this head of doctrine ⁶, and shall notice the attempts which have been made to extract a different opinion from the public writings of our Church ⁷. Afterwards, I shall inquire more at large into the theory of this

the debate. For if the change signified by this Scriptural term takes place in Baptism, it cannot be such a change as is contended for by the opponents of this doctrine. If it is such a radical and complete change of heart and soul as is included in their definition of the word, it does not take place in Baptism.

¹ Chapter I.

² Chapter II.

³ Chapter III.

⁴ Chapter IV.

⁵ Chapter V.

⁶ Chapter VI.

⁷ Chapter VII.

doctrine⁸, the principal variations which have been made from it⁹, and the theory which has been opposed to it with the greatest confidence¹. In conclusion, I shall make a few remarks upon the harmony of this doctrine with the drift and principles of revealed religion, and its consistency with the internal evidence and moral tendencies of the Christian dispensation².

Laying no claim to novelty of opinion or argument, it will be needless to particularize the Authors to whose writings I am indebted. But I must acknowledge my obligations to the late Archbishop of Cashel (Dr. Laurence), who has investigated the views of the compilers and the revisers of our Liturgy, and the sources from which our offices for the Administration of Baptism are derived, in two tracts in controversy with the late Mr. Scott of Hull, replete with erudition, and written in the true spirit of theological criticism.

The examination of the passage of St. John's first Epistle, contained in the fifth Chapter of this work, is the substance of a Sermon preached before the University of Cambridge in March 1817.

⁸ Chapter VIII.

⁹ Chapter IX.

¹ Chapters X. & XI.

² Chapter XII.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER I.

	PAGE
Introduction, containing some remarks on the Advantage of adhering, as much as possible, to the strict Usage of Words in Theological Controversies and Inquiries	1

CHAPTER II.

A View of the Doctrine of Regeneration maintained by the Fathers and ancient Christians	13
---	----

CHAPTER III.

On what Principles the inward and spiritual Grace of Baptism, and the Change of Condition which it implies, have been called Regeneration	24
---	----

CHAPTER IV.

An Inquiry into the Scriptural Authority on which this Doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism is grounded	29
--	----

CHAPTER V.

A Review of the principal Objections which have been taken to this Doctrine from Passages of Scripture	63
--	----

CHAPTER VI.

A View of the Doctrine of Regeneration taught by the Church of England	81
--	----

CHAPTER VII.

	PAGE
A View of the Attempts which have been made to invalidate the Line of Argument pursued in the last Chapter	97

CHAPTER VIII.

The Theory of Regeneration in Baptism considered	115
--	-----

CHAPTER IX.

An Account of the principal Changes which have taken place in the Doctrine of Regeneration, and in the Use of the Word	139
---	-----

CHAPTER X.

An Examination of the Calvinistic Theory of Regeneration	176
--	-----

CHAPTER XI.

A Review of some Difficulties with which the Theory of Regene- ration, examined in the preceding Chapter, is encumbered, and of some Consequences which it involves	206
---	-----

CHAPTER XII.

Conclusion—containing some Remarks on the Harmony of the Doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism with the Drift and Princi- ples and Moral Evidences of revealed Religion	221
---	-----

APPENDIX, containing Remarks on Mr. FABER'S Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration	239
NOTES	299

A

GENERAL VIEW,

&c.

ERRATA.

Page 112, line 29, *read* sufficient inwardly
— 250, — last, — c. 6. pp. 89, 90.
— 252, — last, — c. 5. p. 66.
— 253, — 19, — c. 4. pp. 52, 53.

inaccurate use of words often engenders rash opinions¹, and leads to mischievous consequences. This is a truth to which the daily experience of the world bears witness. The generality of mankind are swayed by words, and led away by popular and current phrases, on the strength of which they build their opinions, and attach themselves to their respective parties, in questions, especially, of a poli-

¹ Locutiones incautas res sequuntur temerariæ.—Bishop Bull, quoted from Grotius.

B

tical or a religious character, without inquiring into the meaning of the expressions which they repeat, or having any just and adequate conception of the ideas which they are intended to represent. This fact shows the necessity of forming accurate and clear notions of those words, which are the hinges of opinions and actions; of adhering as much as possible to their strict sense in our different provinces of inquiry; and of endeavouring to extricate them from that capricious variety of meanings, to which, from the nature of human language and society, they are obviously liable.

In the strictest sciences, words easily obtain a fixed and determinate sense; and even in those branches of natural philosophy, where the progress of knowledge sometimes effects a change in the vocabulary, they soon acquire a steady and settled meaning, and few differences of opinions subsist upon the right explication of the terms. But in those parts of knowledge which have a direct influence upon action, and are, more or less, every man's business, they are subject to frequent changes and modifications. In religion particularly, words have passed, sometimes from a popular to a strict and determinate, sometimes from a strict to a popular and enlarged signification. New doctrines have been grounded on figurative expressions, too rigidly urged, and explained upon wrong principles. Old doctrines have been well nigh exploded in

consequence of a popular turn which has been given to scriptural phrases; and the earliest and least suspicious interpretations of those passages of holy writ, to which we appeal, have become in a manner antiquated, and are sometimes condemned as rash innovations.

An instance or two will serve to illustrate these positions. The word "law" is used in several senses in the New Testament. Sometimes it signifies the Pentateuch, sometimes the whole volume of the Old Testament. Sometimes it is used figuratively², to express any thing which has the force and obligation of a law: and occasionally it seems to mean, in the way of argument and illustration, a law indefinitely, or any particular law. But with these exceptions it signifies the law of Moses, either partially, or in the gross; either as limited to some particular portion of the whole law—the decalogue, for instance, the moral, or the ceremonial law—or as comprehending all these divisions, and the whole complex body of ordinances and enactments, commandments and precepts. Hence it signifies that peculiar dispensation of religion, or code of moral and religious duty, to which the Jews were subject before our Saviour's Advent. In this

² Thus the Gospel is called the law of Christ, the law of faith, the law of righteousness, in allusion to the old or legal dispensation.—See Romans vii. 21. 23. 25; viii. 2.

sense St. Paul uses the word, whenever he compares the law with the Gospel, and excludes it from the office of justification.

But when the heathens set up the plea of the sufficiency of a religion or law of nature in opposition to the Gospel doctrine of salvation by grace and justification by faith in Christ, St. Paul's phraseology and arguments were readily turned against them, in the way of analogy, and by parity of reasoning. Thus the word "law" acquired in popular usage the same abstract sense in which it had been used long before by the philosophers, and designated what is called the law of nature, or that code of moral and religious duties, to which man, independently of all positive laws or particular revelations, is supposed to be subject. This sense of the word was afterwards adopted in the literal and grammatical interpretation of St. Paul's epistles, and led to a distinction between "the law and the Gospel," which, though it might have been useful as a popular distinction, if the analogical reasoning on which it is grounded had been strictly adhered to, is not scriptural, and has unfortunately given occasion to erroneous and dangerous opinions. What the Apostle says of the law of Moses, considered as an imperfect and preparatory dispensation of religion, has been applied to this abstract notion of the law of God, and of moral and religious obligation. "The state of things," says Bishop Taylor, "in which the

whole world is represented in their several periods, is by some made to be the state of every returning sinner, and men are taught that they must pass through the terrors of the law before they can partake of the mercies of the Gospel. The law was a school-master to bring the synagogue to Christ; it was so to them that were under the law, but it cannot be so to us, who are not under the law, but under grace³."

But this is not the worst. Others have applied what St. Paul says of the total freedom of the heathen converts from the yoke of the Mosaic law, and the emancipation of believing Jews from its obligations as a religious dispensation, to the moral law, and believers in general; and have maintained, with equal folly and impiety, that God's elect are released from the obligations of the moral law. But the world would not probably have heard of these paradoxes of Antinomianism, if this analogical sense of the word "law" had not almost superseded its proper and original signification, and exerted an undue influence upon many of St. Paul's commentators and interpreters.

The other instance, which I shall adduce in proof of my observations, is the word to which my attention is now directed—I mean the word, Regeneration.—

³ Taylor's *Unum Necessarium*, Polemical Works, p. 587. Fol. Ed. 1674.

No reasonable doubt can be entertained that it was appropriated to that grace, whatever may be its nature, which is bestowed on us in the Sacrament of Baptism, (including perhaps occasionally, by a common figure of speech, its proper and legitimate effects, considered in conjunction with it;) from the beginnings of Christianity to no very distant era of Ecclesiastical History. In those few passages of the ancient Christian writers ⁴, where it bears another sig-

⁴ Thus Clemens Alexandrinus, speaking of the injunction in the Law of Moses, that the adulteress should be stoned to death, and comparing it with what our Saviour says on this subject, Matt. v. 32 ; xix. 9. Mark x. 11, 12. Luke xvi. 18, undertakes to reconcile the apparent contradiction between the Law and the Gospel on allegorical principles.

Οὐ δὴ μάχεται τῷ Εὐαγγελίῳ ὁ Νόμος· συνάδει δὲ αὐτῷ. Πῶς γὰρ οὐχί, ἐνὸς ὄντος ἀμφοῖν χορηγοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου ; Ἢ γὰρ τοι πορνεύσασα ζῆ μὲν τῇ ἁμαρτίᾳ, ἀπέθανε δὲ ταῖς ἐντολαῖς· ἡ δὲ μετανοήσασα, ὡς ἀναγεννηθεῖσα κατὰ τὴν ἐπιστροφὴν τοῦ βίου, παλιγγενεσίαν ἔχει ζωῆς· τεθνηκυίας μὲν τῆς πόρνῃς τῆς παλαιάς, εἰς βίον δὲ παρελθούσης αὖθις τῆς κατὰ τὴν μετάνοιαν γινομένης.—Stromata, L. II. p. 507. Edit. Potter.

“In truth the Law does not differ from the Gospel ; for how can it be otherwise, since the same Lord is the giver of both ? For the woman who has committed adultery lives to sin, but dies to the commandments. But she that has repented, being born again by the change of her former conversation, experiences a regeneration of life, the old adulterous woman being dead, and she that has her being, by means of repentance, coming forth again to life.”

Here the words born again, and regeneration, (*ἀναγεννηθεῖσα* and *παλιγγενεσία*) are used in an improper and unusual sense ; the adulteress being represented as having been born again by

nification, it is used apparently in a figurative manner, to express such a change as seemed to bear some

repentance or conversion, though the words had acquired another, and that a proper and determinate sense in ecclesiastical language. The distinction between the remission of sins by Regeneration in Baptism, and by repentance and absolution after Baptism, pervades the canons and discipline of the Church, and the writings of the ancient Christians. See Bishop Pearson on the Creed, Article X. p. 368. Fol. Edit. 1692, and the authorities quoted by him.

The same author, in the history which he gives us of St. John's treatment of a young disciple, who had abandoned his Christian profession, subsequently to Baptism, and become head of a band of robbers, says, *Οὐ πρότερον ἀπῆλθεν, ὥς φασι, πρὶν αὐτὸν ἀποκατέστησε τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ, διδοὺς μέγα παράδειγμα μετανοίας ἀληθινῆς, καὶ μέγα γνῶρισμα παλιγγενεσίας, τροπαῖον ἀναστάσεως βλεπομένης.* "He did not depart, they say, before he had restored him to the Church, giving a remarkable instance of a true repentance, and a signal example of a Regeneration, a trophy of a visible resurrection." *Quis dives salvetur?*

Here Clemens in his figurative style calls the young man's repentance and restoration to the Church a great example of regeneration, and a trophy of a visible resurrection. The learned Valesius, therefore, translates the passage *iteratæ Regenerationis documentum.*

To the same purpose he says, a few lines above, of the young man, *Εἶτα τρέμων ἔκλαε πικρῶς· προσελθόντα δὲ τὸν γέροντα περιέλαβεν, ἀπολογούμενος ταῖς οἰμωγαῖς ὡς ἡδύνατο, καὶ τοῖς δάκρυσι βαπτιζόμενος ἐκ δευτέρου.* "Then trembling, he wept bitterly, and embraced the old man as he approached him, excusing himself, as he could, with groans, and being baptized again with tears." So that he seems to call his conversion a new birth, upon the same principle that he calls his godly sorrow, manifested by groans and tears, a second Baptism.

In a passage of his history, speaking of the happy effects of

analogy in magnitude and importance to the change effected in Baptism. At the time of the Reforma-

the patience of the martyrs of Lyons on those Christians whose fears had led them to renounce the faith, Eusebius says,

Ἐνεγένετο πολλὴ χαρὰ τῇ παρθένῳ μητρὶ, οὗς ὡς νεκροὺς ἐξέτρῳσε, τούτους ζῶντας ἀπολαμβάνουσιν· δι' ἐκείνων γὰρ οἱ πλείους τῶν ἡρνημένων ἀνεμετροῦντο καὶ “ἀνεκνίσκοντο” καὶ ἀνέζωπουροῦντο. L. V. ch. i.

“The Virgin Mother experienced great joy, when she received back living those whom she had cast forth from her womb as dead: for by means of them, most of those who had denied Christ retraced their steps, and were again brought forth, and again kindled into life.”

But passages of this kind are very rare, and so evidently use the words in question in an improper and unusual sense, that they do not at all invalidate the assertion of learned divines, that the word “Regeneration” is constantly used by the ancient Christians to signify Baptism and its effects.

Mr. Faber, indeed, (p. 181) contends that in these passages Clemens uses the words in their strict and proper sense, to signify what he calls *moral*, in opposition to Baptismal *Regeneration*. In support of this opinion he affirms, that *the youth had received Baptism dissentingly, secularly, impenitently, unworthily, or else, perhaps, under the influence of excited animal feelings.*

The story as related by Clemens does not furnish the slightest ground for this assertion, which is, in fact, completely gratuitous. On the contrary, the whole tenor of the narrative proves that he is considered as having fallen from a state of grace. The Apostle is not said to have found fault with the Bishop, to whose care he had entrusted him, for having baptized him hastily, without sufficient inquiry into his spiritual state, but for having neglected and lost sight of him after he had received the seal of Baptism.

Mr. Faber's censure of Valesius is altogether misplaced. His translation of the word *παλιγγενεσία* is evidently intended to be

tion, the word was commonly used in a more loose and popular way, to signify sometimes justification, some-

a sort of comment upon the unusual meaning of the word. He calls the young man's repentance a second or repeated Regeneration, on the same principle that Clemens calls his penitential tears a second Baptism. His note on the words βαπτίζόμενος ἐκ δευτέρου is: *Eleganter locutus est Clemens R. nam pœnitentia alter Baptismus est qui lacrymarum fonte perficitur, ut ait Gregorius Naz. in Oratione de Baptismo.*

On the other passages quoted from Clemens Alex. Strom. L. II. Mr. Faber makes this comment:—"The woman adduced by Clemens had evidently been baptized; but according to his statement of the case, having fallen into harlotry, she thence showed that she had received Baptism insincerely, and, therefore, had never been morally regenerated. Afterwards she repented, and was in all the purposes and actings of her soul born again."

Mr. F. produces the case of this harlot as another example of a person who had been baptized in insincerity, and afterwards on her repentance was born again. Whereas this harlot is merely an abstract personage, an ideal representative of a class, who could not, therefore, have been baptized in insincerity. Hence it is a necessary consequence of Mr. F.'s view of *this* case (what none of the Fathers, I conceive, ever imagined), that they who fall into this or any deadly sin, after adult Baptism, must have received Baptism dissemblingly and unworthily.

I have omitted the argument which I had raised in the former editions of this work, on the word οἶον (*οἶον ἀναγεννηθεῖσα*), because the construction which I had put on it, though adopted by many learned writers, is, to say the least, doubtful.

But there is a passage in Chrysostome (Comment. in Gal. iv. 19,) which shows very plainly what was the mind of the Fathers when they used the term Regeneration to describe some very signal instances of repentance. "See," he says, "how St. Paul is distracted and disturbed. *'My brethren, I beseech you.'*

times conversion, or the turning from sinful courses, sometimes repentance, or that gradual change of heart and life, which is likewise styled renovation. Hence in popular language it came to signify a great and general reformation of habits and character, and the words "regenerate and unregenerate" were substituted for the words converted and unconverted, renewed and unrenewed, righteous and wicked. But in the hands of the systematic Calvinists, the word passed from the popular to a strict and de-

'My children, of whom I am again travailing in birth,' he is imitating a mother trembling for her children, *'until Christ be again formed in you.'* Do you observe his fatherly yearnings? a sort of despondency befitting an Apostle? Do you observe how he utters a cry more bitter than that of women labouring with child? You have corrupted the image (*i. e.* the image of God), you have lost your kinsmanship, you have changed the form (or character) that had been stamped upon you. You have need of *another Regeneration and reformation.* Yet still I call you, abortious and born out of due time as you are, children. He does not address them in such terms, but spares them, and is unwilling to strike and add wounds to wounds."

It is evident, from this passage, that when the Fathers use the word Regeneration to denote repentance, they do not intend that the persons repenting had not been born again in Baptism, but that they had fallen from a state of adoption, and had need, so to speak, of a second new birth; and in the very few passages where the word occurs in this signification, it is used in an improper (or catachrestical, to use Mr. Faber's language,) sense: such a repentance being considered, on account of the greatness of the change effected by it, as a sort of second or supplementary Regeneration.

terminate meaning; and they pronounced regeneration to be an infusion of a habit of grace, or a radical change of all the parts and faculties of the soul, taking place at the decisive moment of the effectual call. From hence the transition to a sensible change was easy and natural, and what was a theological speculation in the system of scholastic divines, became, in the hands of less subdued and less calculating spirits, the stronghold of enthusiasm.

If, therefore, the progress of enthusiastic opinions and habits, and of other doctrines by no means honourable to the divine perfections, is connected in any degree with the changes which have taken place in the received use of the word Regeneration, it will not be an unprofitable task to examine the grounds of its more ancient signification, and to point out its correspondence with the scriptural phraseology and doctrine. But though there is an obvious connexion between the right use of words and sound doctrine, it is not the word, but the doctrine implied in it, on which I would principally insist. For it is almost needless to say that many of our Divines, who maintain the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism in its most unadulterated sense, often use the word *regenerate*, in compliance with popular usage, to signify a man living habitually under the influence of the Spirit of grace; *unregenerate*, to signify a man not living habitually under that in-

fluence⁵. Still it is to be wished that they had avoided this ambiguity of language, and had kept close to the more ancient and more correct usage of the word in question.

⁵ In this sense Bishop Taylor uses the words regenerate, regeneration, &c. He says, that "an unregenerate man may have received the Spirit of God." That, "to have received the Spirit of God is not the propriety of the regenerate, but to be led by him, to be conducted by the Spirit in all our ways and counsels, to obey his motions, to entertain his doctrine, to do his pleasure: this is that which gives the distinction and denomination." *Unum Necessarium, Polemical Works*, p. 787.

CHAPTER II.

A VIEW OF THE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION MAINTAINED BY THE FATHERS AND ANCIENT CHRISTIANS.

WHEN opinions, founded on current and acknowledged interpretations of Scripture, have been received without doubt or dispute from the earliest times of Christianity to a comparatively late age, the prejudices in their favour, and against the innovations which have been made upon them in latter days, are fair and legitimate. There seems indeed to be some presumption in setting up our private opinions and interpretations against the unanimous testimony of the early Christians; and it is evidently dangerous. For if we will not admit their unvarying and uncontradicted testimony in proof of an apostolical and scriptural doctrine, I know not how we shall convince an unbeliever that they are sufficient witnesses of the authenticity of sacred writ, or of the authority of its canon.

In modern times we have been taught that Regeneration is a thing quite unconnected with baptism: that it may indeed take place in that sacrament as well as at any other time, but that to suppose it in any proper sense dependent on it, is an unreasonable and unscriptural opinion. But, previous to a more particular inquiry, these assertions seem rather to prove that they, who speak in this manner, have affixed improper notions to the word, than that the ancient Christians universally mistook the sense of Scripture, and gave in to an opinion contrary to reason and piety.

It has been shown, beyond any reasonable doubt, "that all the ancient Christians, not one man excepted, do take the word, Regeneration, to signify baptism; and all of them do understand that rule of our Saviour, 'Except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of heaven,' of baptism¹." After what has been written on this subject, it will be needless to adduce passages of their works in proof of these positions, which are legitimate deductions from plain matters of fact, and a laborious investigation of their writings.

Their doctrine has been stated with his usual perspicuity and judgment by Waterland, in his

¹ Wall on Infant Baptism, chap. x. 3. ch. vi. 1. The reader may refer to this valuable work for the proofs of these positions of the learned author.

celebrated Sermon on Regeneration; and his statement is evidently grounded on a severe examination of their works, and a judicious induction of particulars.

He first teaches us, in conformity to the opinion of the ancient Christians, that Regeneration is a spiritual change wrought upon any person in the right use of baptism, whereby he is translated from his natural state in Adam to a spiritual state in Christ. That every one must be born of water and of the Spirit; not once of water, and once of the Spirit, but once of the Spirit in and by water; of the Spirit primarily and effectively, of the water secondarily and instrumentally. That the word Regeneration is so appropriated to Baptism as to exclude any other conversion or repentance, not considered in conjunction with Baptism, from being signified by that name. That in an active sense it signifies our admission into a spiritual state in Christ, in a passive sense our entrance into it; and that it carries with it the remission of sins, and a covenant claim to everlasting happiness.

He then proceeds to lay down the distinction between Regeneration and Renovation². He states

² When we speak of renovation as distinguished from regeneration, we mean that practical and progressive renewal of the inward frame or moral habits, which is the usual sense of the word in Scripture. But the change wrought in man by the Holy Ghost in Baptism is likewise called renovation, or renewal, Titus iii. 5, where the washing of regeneration, and the renewal of the

that they are always distinct in theory, and often, particularly in the case of infants, in fact and reality.

Holy Ghost, seem to be parallel and equivalent phrases; or, perhaps, baptism is called *the washing of regeneration and renewal*.

Hence in the writings of the ancient Christians, men are said to be renewed as well as regenerated in Baptism. So Cyprian de Habitu Virginum, p. 102. Omnes quidem qui ad divinum munus et patrium Baptismi sanctificatione præveniunt, hominem illic veterem gratia lavacri salutaris exponunt, et *innovati Spiritu Sancto* a sordibus contagionis antiquæ iterata nativitate purgantur.

This distinction between the baptismal renewal, and that gradual improvement of the inward frame which the word *renewal* more commonly denotes, has been stated by Augustin, lib. xiv. de Trin. c. 17. Sane ista renovatio non momento uno fit, sicut momento fit uno illa renovatio in Baptismo, remissione omnium peccatorum. Neque enim vel unum quantulumcunque remanet, quod non remittatur. Sed quemadmodum aliud est carere febribus, aliud ab infirmitate, quæ febribus facta est, revalescere: itemque aliud est infixum telum de corpore demere; aliud vulnus quod eo factum est secundâ curatione sanare: ita prima curatio est causam remove re languoris, quod per omnium peccatorum indulgentiam fit. Secunda, ipsum levare languorem, quod fit paulatim proficiendo in renovatione hujus imaginis. Quæ duo monstrantur in Psalmo; ubi legitur, *Qui propitius fit omnibus iniquitatibus tuis*, quod fit in Baptismo. Deinde sequitur, *Qui sanat omnes infirmitates tuas*, quod fit quotidianis accessibus, cum hæc imago renovatur. De quâ re Apostolus apertissime locutus est, dicens, *Etsi exterior homo noster corrumpitur, sed interior renovatur de die in diem*. Renovatur autem in agnitione Dei, hoc est justitiâ et sanctitate veritatis.

This distinction between renovation in Baptism, and the renewal of the habits or inward frame, is the same as the distinction stated in the text between regeneration and renovation.

That regeneration is a change of the whole spiritual state; renovation a change of inward frame or disposition, which in adults is rather a qualification or capacity for regeneration than regeneration itself. That in infants regeneration necessarily takes place without renovation, but in adults renovation exists (or at least ought to exist) before, in, and after Baptism.

Regeneration, he proceeds, is the joint work of the water and of the Spirit, or to speak more properly of the Spirit only; renovation is the joint work of the Spirit and the man.

Regeneration comes only once, in or through Baptism. Renovation exists before, in, and after Baptism, and may be often repeated. Regeneration, being a single act, can have no parts, and is incapable of increase. Renovation is in its very nature progressive. Regeneration, though suspended as to its effects and benefits, cannot be totally lost in the present life. Renovation may be often repeated and totally lost.

Afterwards he illustrates this doctrine by applying it to four separate cases.

1. Grown persons coming to Baptism properly qualified, receive at once the grace of regeneration: but, however well prepared, they are not regenerate without Baptism. Afterwards renovation grows more and more within them by the indwelling of the Spirit.

2. As to infants, their innocence and incapacity are to them instead of repentance, which they do not want, and of actual faith, which they cannot have: and they are capable of being born again, and adopted by God, because they bring no obstacle. They stipulate, and the Holy Spirit translates them out of a state of nature into a state of grace, favour, and acceptance. In their case, regeneration precedes, and renovation follows after, and they are the temple of the Spirit, till they defile themselves with sin.

3. As to those who fall off after regeneration, their covenant state abides, but without any saving effect, because without present renovation: but this saving effect may be repaired and recovered by repentance.

4. With respect to those who receive Baptism in a state of hypocrisy or impenitency, though this Sacrament can only increase their condemnation, still pardon and grace are conditionally made over to them, and the saving virtue of regeneration, which had been hitherto suspended, takes effect, when they truly repent and unfeignedly believe the Gospel³.

³ Mr. Faber has a long note, in which he states his objections to this notion of suspension. What is meant by suspension is simply this. That in the case of persons baptized in a state of hypocrisy or impenitence (and the Fathers extend the same rule to persons baptized in schism and heresy), the inward grace does

This clear statement of the learned author contains a plain account of the grace conferred, and the change which takes place, in Baptism; and this is what is meant by those Divines, who maintain that regeneration is, in the strict sense of the word, the inward and spiritual Grace of Baptism. The identity, if I may so express myself, of Baptism and regeneration, is a doctrine which manifestly pervades the writings of the Fathers. It is moreover evident that they did not imagine that Baptism produces any saving effect in adults without faith and repentance, or, in other words, without some previous renewal of the inward frame. Nor do they appear to have supposed that any conscious or active renewal of the soul takes place in infants. Hence it follows that they must have maintained this distinction between regeneration and renovation (conversion, *i. e.* repentance, or a gradual process of spiritual improvement), which in the present day has been styled a novel contrivance. Sufficient proofs, however, of a positive kind, may be collected from their own writings, that they maintained this distinction ⁴.

not accompany the outward sign : but that this grace may be obtained by repentance, and that when obtained, it is, in some mysterious manner, connected with the Baptism which had been formerly administered.

⁴ *Sicut autem bono Catechumeno Baptismus deest ad capessendum regnum cœlorum, sic malo baptizato vera conversio. Qui enim dixit, Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ et Spiritu, non*

The cases of adults properly qualified, and of those who fall off after Baptism, are in strict conformity

intrabit in regnum cœlorum: ipse etiam dixit, Nisi abundaverit justitia vestra plusquam Scribarum et Phariseorum, non intrabitis in regnum cœlorum. Nam ne secuta esset justitia Catechumeni dictum est, *Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ et Spiritu, non intrabit in regnum cœlorum.* Rursus ne percepto baptismo secuta esset iniquitas baptizatorum, dictum est, *Nisi abundaverit justitia vestra plusquam Scribarum et Phariseorum, non intrabitis in regnum cœlorum.* Alterum sine altero parum est; utrumque perficit illius possessionis hæredem. Augustin, de Baptismo, contra Donatistas. L. iv. 21.

Sicut in Abraham præcessit fidei justitia, et accessit circumcisio, signaculum justitiæ fidei, ita in Cornelio præcessit sanctificatio spiritalis in dono Spiritûs Sancti, et accessit sacramentum regenerationis in lavacro baptismi. Et sicut in Isaac, qui octavo natiuitatis suæ die circumciscus est, præcessit signaculum justitiæ fidei, et, quoniam patris fidem imitatus est, secuta est in crescente ipsa justitia, cujus signaculum in infanti præcesserat: ita et in baptizatis infantibus præcedit regenerationis sacramentum, et, si Christianam tenuerint pietatem, sequitur etiam in corde conversio, cujus mysterium præcessit in corpore. Quibus rebus omnibus apparet aliud esse sacramentum Baptismi, aliud conversionem cordis, sed salutem hominum ex utroque compleri. De Baptismo contra Donatistas. L. iv. c. xxiv.

In the latter quotation the word *mysterium* does not signify a sacrament, or sacramental sign, in the stricter sense of the word, but a moral sign—a sign of the duty to which Baptism obliges us, and circumcision obliged Isaac and his posterity. It is well known that the word *sacramentum* or *mysterium* was used by the ancients in a very different latitude from that which it has obtained in modern days—*An outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof.* What Augustin teaches us in this passage, is,

to the doctrine and discipline of the ancient Churches. Even Augustin, who first introduced into the Church the doctrine of absolute predestination, did not assert the indefectibility of true grace, nor confine the grace of regeneration to those who, in his system, are called according to God's purpose, and endowed with the special gift of perseverance.

The regeneration of all baptized Infants, without exception, is a doctrine likewise every where avowed by the Fathers, and established by the canons and discipline of the Church. In Augustin's controversy with the Pelagians, who denied the doctrine of original sin, it is assumed as a point universally acknowledged, and forms one of the bases of his argument.

The case of those persons who are baptized in hypocrisy or impenitence, is stated in conformity to ancient opinion⁵. In Augustin's controversy with the Donatists, he assumes this case as a medium of

1. That adults, though converted, are not regenerate without Baptism. 2. That baptized infants, though regenerate, are not converted.

N. B. *Conversio cordis*, in this passage of St. Augustin, does not signify conversion from a state of actual sin, but the general state and bias of the heart to Godward; the renewal of the mind, as St. Paul speaks, Rom. xii. 2.

⁵ Dr. Pusey states, however, that there was a difference of opinion on this subject. For though this was the doctrine of Augustin and the African Church, there were other Fathers, especially of the Grecian Churches, who held that persons baptized in that state could not be restored by repentance.

proof⁶, and, of course, as an acknowledged doctrine. The Donatists held, agreeably to Cyprian's opinion, that the Baptism of schismatics is invalid; and since they contended that, with the exception of their own Churches, all the Christians of their days were in a state of schism, they affirmed that none but themselves were validly baptized, and that none

⁶ Quomodo accipienti non prodest baptismus ei qui seculo verbis non factis renuntiat, sic non prodest ei qui in schismate vel in hæresi baptizatur; utrique autem correcto prodesse incipit quod ante non proderat, sed tamen inerat. Contra Don. de Bapt. l. iv. c. iv.

Etiam Simonem Magum per baptismum ipsa pepererat: cui tamen dictum est quod non haberet partem in hæreditate Christi. Nunquid ei baptismus, nunquid evangelium, nunquid sacramenta defuerunt? Sed quia charitas defuit, frustra natus est, et ei expédiebat fortasse non nasci. Contra Don. l. i. c. viii.

Aliud est enim, *Omnis qui intrabit in regnum cælorum, prius nascitur ex aquâ et Spiritu*, quod Dominus dixit et verum est. Aliud autem, *Omnis qui nascitur ex aquâ et Spiritu intrabit in regnum cælorum*, quod utique falsum est. Nam et Simon ille Magus natus est ex aquâ et Spiritu, et tamen non intravit in regnum cælorum. Contra Don. l. iv. c. xii.

Talis baptismus, cum eo male utuntur, necat, sicut illis de quibus ait Apostolus—*Bonus odor Christi erat in mortem*. Contra Don. l. vi. c. xl.

Quod ante datum est tunc incipit valere ad salutem, cum illa fictio veraci confessione recesserit.

Neque nos dicimus quod ubicunque et quomodocunque baptizati *gratiam* Baptismi consequuntur, si gratia baptismi in *ipsâ salute* intelligitur, quæ per celebrationem Sacramenti confertur; sed hanc salutem multi nec intus consequuntur, quamvis Sacramentum, quod per se sanctum est, eos habere manifestum est. Contra Don. l. iv. c. xiv.

could enter into the kingdom of God without receiving Baptism from their Ministers. But Augustin replied that, even allowing the truth of their accusation, they who are baptized in schism are in the same situation with those who are baptized in impenitence or hypocrisy. For as the latter participate in the saving effects of regeneration, when they repent of their sins, and believe the Gospel with sincerity, so the former enjoy the benefits of their Baptism, whenever they renounce their schism, and are received into the communion of the Church.

Having given this statement of the doctrine of the ancient Christians, my next step will be to inquire on what grounds the change of which we are speaking appears to have been denominated Regeneration.

CHAPTER III.

ON WHAT PRINCIPLES THE INWARD AND SPIRITUAL GRACE OF BAPTISM, AND THE CHANGE OF CONDITION WHICH IT IMPLIES, HAVE BEEN CALLED REGENERATION.

SOME divines have supposed that the word Regeneration, and certain phrases of the Old Testament, which denote the spiritual renewal and improvement of the inward frame, are equivalent and synonymous expressions. When, for instance, David prays to God *to create in him a new heart*, and to *renew a right spirit within him*¹, they suppose that he is praying for the grace of regeneration; when God calls upon the Israelites to *make them a new heart and a new spirit*², or promises that he *will put a new spirit within them, and make them a heart of*

¹ Psalm li. 10.

² Ezekiel xviii. 31.

flesh ³, these phrases are in their opinion equivalent to the words New Birth, or being born again. It is evident, that so far as regeneration *implies* repentance and the renewal of the inner man, so far it *implies* the creation of a new heart, a new spirit, and a heart of flesh. But this renewal of the heart and spirit is described in these texts, compared with one another, as the joint work of God, or the Holy Ghost, and of man himself: as a gift or blessing bestowed on us by God, and as a duty which we owe to him and ourselves. On the other hand, regeneration, though it requires certain previous qualifications in those who are capable of possessing them, is entirely the work of Christ and the Holy Spirit: a spiritual change in which the principle of self-action implanted in man bears no part.

In truth, there is no real identity of meaning in these phrases, or forms of speech. For those phrases, according to the customary usage of the sacred language, imply nothing more than a great change for the better, the reformation and improvement of the religious principles and habits. Whereas, *to be born again* is a metaphor founded on a comparison of a different kind, and, on the common principles of figurative language, leads to the notion of a distinct change of condition; a passage, if I may so express myself, from one state of existence to another. This

³ Ezekiel xi. 19; xxxvi. 26, 27. Jer. xxxii. 39.

is the sense in which the Fathers understood it: and accordingly they speak of three births incident to Christians: the Natural Birth, the New Birth of Baptism, and the Regeneration of the Body in the last day.

In addition to the argument deduced from the etymology of the word, and the natural force of the metaphor, every research which has been made into the history of this expression, confirms the sense which the Catholic Christians affixed to it; and the illustrations which this sense has received are derived from the most unsuspected sources⁴.—In the writings of Pagans the word has been used to signify the act of initiation into their mysteries,

⁴ Non solum Judæis sed gentibus etiam solenne fuit, sacrorum initiationem regenerationis vocabulo significare. Apuleius Met. xi. “Nam et inferûm claustra, et salutis tutela in Deæ manu posita; ipsaque *traditio ad instar voluntariæ mortis, et precariæ salutis celebratur*. Quippe cum transactis vitæ temporibus jam in ipso finitæ lucis limine constitutos, quîs tamen tutò possent *magna religionis committi silentia*, numen Deæ solet eligere, et suâ providentiâ *renatos ad nova reponere rursus salutis curricula*.”

Apuleius diem initiationis *natalem sacrum* vocat, et Sacerdotem, a quo fuerat initiatus, appellat patrem suum—“Stipatum me religiosâ cohorte deducit ad proximas *balneas*, et prius *sueti lavacro traditum*, præfatus Deûm veniam, purissime circumrorans *abluit*.” Justinianus Novell. 73. “Si quis manumittens servum aut ancillam suam cives denunciaverit Romanos, sciat ex hâc lege, quod qui libertatem acceperit, *ἔξει παρεπόμενον εὐθὺς καὶ τὸ τῶν χρυσῶν δακτυλίων, καὶ τὸ τῆς παλιγγενεσίας δίκαιον*.”

when the votary, after much previous discipline and preparation, was supposed to pass into a new state of religious being, and to contract a new relation to the Deity. In the Roman law, the same phrase was applied to the manumission of a slave, his passage, that is, from a servile to a free condition. And there is little reason to doubt that the same figure of speech was applied by the Jewish doctors to the initiation of their proselytes into their law and religious polity. It is well ascertained that Baptism formed a part of this act of religion: and it appears both ⁵ from the conduct of John the Baptist, and from ⁶ the questions which were put to him by the Pharisees, that Baptism was understood to be a sign of initiation, and a token of entrance into a new state of life, and new professions and engagements of a religious nature. Our Saviour therefore seems to have adopted the same mode of speaking in his conversation with the learned Jew, Nicodemus; inti-

Servus manumissus natalibus restituitur, in quibus initio omnes homines fuerunt. Ergo ex jure Romano adoptionis et regenerationis voces interpretandæ sunt. Wetstein in John iii. 3.

All these usages of the word itself, or of equivalent phrases, serve to illustrate the meaning of the word Regeneration. In eo (says the learned Dodwell) versatur universa ferè Novi Testamenti argumentatio, ut quæcunque essent sive apud Judæos, sive apud Gentiles, privilegia de quibus gloriarentur, ea Christianis potiori præstantiorique ratione convenire probarentur. Diss. Cyp. 13.

⁵ Matt. iii. Mark i. Luke iii. John i.

⁶ John i. 19, &c.

mating to him that if he wished to enter into the kingdom of God, it was no less necessary for him to become his proselyte, to be initiated into the privileges and undertake the engagements of his religion, than it was for the Gentile to be initiated into the privileges and undertake the engagements of the Mosaic law, if he wished to partake of the civil and religious advantages of the Jewish polity⁷.

Hence, though in all these cases the New Birth *implies* a perceptible and conscious change of inward dispositions and habits, both as a qualification for it in capable subjects, and as a duty to which it binds the regenerated person, the new birth itself is distinct in theory from that change of habits and manners. But this distinction, to which the etymology of the word, the nature of the metaphor, and the history of the expression obviously conduct us, explaining and confirming that interpretation which was put upon it by the ancient Christians, will be rendered more apparent, when we institute an inquiry into those passages of Scripture which allude to this question, and lead us to conclude that such a change as we denominate Regeneration does actually take place in Baptism.

⁷ Baptism may be likewise styled Regeneration, or a New Birth, in a moral sense, because it is that point from whence we contract a solemn engagement to lead new or holy lives, and become new men by promise and profession. But it always implies a change wrought in the soul, by a new principle of spiritual life infused into it.

CHAPTER IV.

AN INQUIRY INTO THE SCRIPTURAL AUTHORITY ON
WHICH THIS DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION IN
BAPTISM IS GROUNDED.

HAVING stated the reasons which appear to justify (*i. e.* to justify *à priori*, previous to any enquiry into the Scriptural proof,) the appropriation of this word Regeneration to Baptism, I proceed to inquire into the Scriptural authority on which the doctrine, expressed by this term and other words of the same family, (*i. e.* homonymous,) is grounded. I entertain no doubt that the ancient Christians understood these words in their proper signification, and departed neither from accurate phraseology, nor sound doctrine, when they used them almost exclusively in this limited and appropriate sense, to signify that sacramental and initiatory change which is described in the New Testament under a considerable variety of phrases. But the main point to be proved is, that such a change as they usually designate by the word Regeneration, a mysterious

change of religious condition and spiritual relationship to God, does actually take place in Baptism, and is described in divers passages of Scripture, both by the words under discussion, and by other phrases and figures of a similar import ¹.

In order to present the reader with a clearer view of the passages which bear upon this question, I shall range them under the following heads:—

I. Those which speak of this change by the name of Regeneration, and connect it with water and Baptism.

II. Those which speak of it in parallel and corresponding expressions, with an evident allusion to the same ceremony.

III. Those which attribute it simply to washing and Baptism.

IV. Those which describe the change in other figures and phrases, not exactly parallel to those contained in the former classes.

I. There are only two passages of Scripture in which Regeneration and Baptism are expressly combined and identified with each other. The one occurs in our Lord's conversation with Nicodemus recorded in St. John's Gospel: *Except a man be born again*, or, as the phrase is explained, *born of*

¹ To prevent misapprehension, it must be remembered, that this change of relationship to God always supposes a spiritual change, a *grace communicated to the soul* as well as a *relative change of federal condition*.

*water and of the Spirit, he cannot see, or enter into the kingdom of God*². The other in St. Paul's Epistle to Titus, where the Apostle asserts that God *hath saved us by the washing* (rather perhaps the bath or laver) *of regeneration*³. The ancient Christians, while they ground the necessity of Baptism as a means or instrument of spiritual regeneration principally on the former text, uniformly apply the latter to the same sacrament. Nor do they appear to have entertained any suspicion that these passages are ambiguous, or that they could admit of any other than the received and current interpretation.

I have already shown what sense was commonly affixed to the word Regeneration and other kindred words in our Saviour's days: that they signified both among Jews and Gentiles a change of religious, or, in some cases, of civil condition and privileges: and that this change was usually symbolized by an outward action, sometimes by this very ceremony of washing or Baptism. It may be asked then, whether it was our Lord's intention to perplex and bewilder, or to instruct and edify, Nicodemus? to shadow out to him in enigmatical language a change of which he could have no just conception? or to converse with him on his own principles, and in conformity to a mode of thinking and speaking to which he was habituated? If we adopt the old in-

² John iii. 3. 5.

³ Titus iii. 5.

terpretation of this passage, the conversation seems to be suited to the person and character of Nicodemus, and conformable to the general tone of our Lord's instructions. For though it is, like many of his discourses, figurative and parabolical, it alludes to a well-known custom and a received opinion, and makes use of a phraseology which was familiar to the learned, and probably well understood by the generality of his countrymen.

On the same grounds there can be no reasonable doubt that *the washing of regeneration*, mentioned by St. Paul, signifies Baptism, or baptismal regeneration. For since regeneration signified both with Jews and Gentiles, a mystical and symbolical entrance into a new state of life, St. Paul, when he speaks of the washing of regeneration, as a means or instrument of salvation, does not, in all probability, deviate from this usage of the word. Indeed, this sense of it is confirmed by a comparison of these passages with what our Saviour says in his last commission to his Apostles. *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*⁴. For as it is evident that to be *born again*, or *born of water and of the Spirit*, signifies the same thing as to be *saved by the washing of regeneration*, so there can be no reasonable doubt that to be *saved by the washing of regeneration* is equivalent to being *saved by Baptism*⁵, and conse-

⁴ Mark xvi. 16.

⁵ Compare 1 Pet. iii. 21.

quently that to be *saved by Baptism*, and to be *born again*, or *born of water and of the Spirit*, are one and the same thing.

Much stress indeed has been laid upon a notion, that in the passage of St. John's Gospel Regeneration is spoken of as absolutely necessary to salvation, in such a sense, that without it no individual of mankind can possibly enter into the kingdom of heaven: whereas Baptism is necessary only in a restricted sense, being, as our Church teaches us, "necessary to salvation where it can be had." This distinction is principally built upon an opinion which some commentators have entertained, that the mention of Baptism was designedly omitted⁶ in the latter clause of our Lord's speech, to show that it is necessary only in this qualified sense. The truth is, that the mention of Baptism in this clause would have been quite superfluous; for our Saviour speaks of Baptism as a consequence of belief, and if the men to whom the Apostles were sent rejected the Gospel, it was needless to say a syllable about their Baptism. In fact this passage is qualified, not by the omission of a few superfluous words, but by natural equity, and the proportion which the several parts of religion bear to each other. The same principles apply with equal force to our Saviour's

⁶ *He that believeth not, shall be damned.*

address to Nicodemus⁷. It condemns the wilful and culpable omission of Baptism, but cannot (so at least charity bids us presume) apply to cases where *it is not to be had*; where it is impeded by accident, or prevented by an unfortunate concurrence of circumstances.

It has been affirmed, that *to be born of water and of the Spirit*, signifies to be born again of the Spirit⁸, acting like water, and cleansing and purifying the heart. But this explanation is evidently forced and

⁷ This is the construction which our Church puts on the passage in the Office of Baptism for those of riper years:—

“Beloved, ye hear in this Gospel the express words of our Saviour Christ, that, *Except a man, &c.* Whereby ye perceive the great necessity of this Sacrament, *where it may be had.*”

⁸ *Per aquam et Spiritum*: quasi diceret, per Spiritum qui purgando et irrigando fideles animas vice aquæ fungitur. Aquam ergo et Spiritum accipio simpliciter pro Spiritu qui aqua est—renasci aquâ et Spiritu nihil aliud est, quàm vim illam Spiritûs recipere, quæ in animâ id facit, quod aqua in corpore. Calvin. Inst. l. iv. c. xvi. § 25.

Ex veteribus nonnullos citare licet, qui illa verba metaphoricæ accipiunt. Antidotus ad Conc. Trid. Opuscula, p. 298.

This is an assertion which neither Calvin nor any of those who have copied from him, have ever verified. Hooker, who does not speak at random, positively denies it. “Of all the ancients, there is not one to be named that ever did otherwise expound or allege the place, than of external baptism.” B. v. S. 58. Vol. ii. p. 244. Oxford Ed.

Grotius has followed Calvin’s interpretation, and it is generally adopted by the Arminian Divines. Limborch, Theol. Chris. l. v. c. lxvi. § 25.

unnatural, and scarcely consistent, as it would seem, with grammatical analogy, and the common rules of construction. It is true that two words in this construction may be conceived to express one thing. For instance, *life and breath* may signify the breath of life; *grace and apostleship*, the apostolical grace, the grace or gift of the apostleship. In passages like these, where one of the nouns substantive, connected by a conjunction copulative, assumes the force of an adjective, or, what is equivalent, of the genitive or possessive case, the words, nevertheless, in their plain grammatical construction, admit of a clear and consistent meaning. But they do not justify this attempt to fetch out such an interpretation by giving to the word, *water*, a highly metaphorical and uncommon sense⁹.

With as little reason it has been urged, that the passage of the Epistle to Titus has no reference, or at the utmost only an allusion to Baptism¹, but

⁹ In reference to Matthew iii. 11: "He shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost, and with fire:" a Baptism with fire actually took place on the day of Pentecost, which was prophetically symbolical of the powerful working and effects of the Holy Spirit.

¹ Limborch, Theol. Chris. l. v. ch. lxvi. § 26.

It is contended either that this passage merely alludes to baptism, or that Regeneration is called a washing by a metonymy of the sign for the thing signified. I confess I do not understand how the sign can be used for the thing signified, when both the sign and thing signified are mentioned in the same clause, in their natural relation to each other. But at all events, since we are taught that *he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*,

speaks solely of that internal Regeneration which purifies the soul, in the same manner that water cleanses and purifies the body. Our old teachers, I am persuaded, saw more deeply into this subject, and judged more truly of the meaning of these passages, than our modern masters. "When the letter of the Law," says Hooker, "hath two things plainly and expressly specified, Water and the Spirit—Water as a duty required on our parts, the Spirit as a gift which God bestoweth—there is danger in presuming so to interpret it, as if the clause that concerneth ourselves were more than needful²."

and that *God has saved us by the washing of Regeneration*, we do not act very consistently, when we interpret the baptism of which our Saviour speaks in a literal, the washing or laver, which St. Paul mentions, in a metonymical sense.

At other times it is affirmed that washing is only a metaphor, and that Regeneration is called a washing in the same manner that Christ is called *a vine*, and Jehovah *a shield*. Certainly if it were as unreasonable to suppose that washing in this text can mean washing or baptism, in a literal sense, as to suppose that Christ is literally a vine, or God literally a shield, we should be compelled to explain the word in a figurative manner. Or, even if we had good ground for supposing that Regeneration is in no way connected with Baptism, we might perhaps have conjectured that the washing of Regeneration signified the cleansing or purifying effect of Regeneration. But since Scripture affirms that *he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*, and that *Baptism saveth us*, we should offend against the rules of just interpretation by affixing a metaphorical sense to this expression. For, as Hooker says, "where a literal interpretation will stand, the farthest from the letter is always the worst."

² Hooker's Eccl. Polity, B. v. ch. lix.

II. But though these passages, the former especially, were on account of the distinct and unambiguous manner in which they are worded, alleged by the ancient Christians as the main grounds and principles of the doctrine of baptismal Regeneration, it is amply confirmed by other texts, and by continual allusions to it, as a thing well known and thoroughly understood. For undesigned and incidental testimonies, which do not come down to us in the shape of precepts or dogmatical determinations, but of appeals to the converts, and allusions to received opinions, are a strong confirmation of the truth and general reception of the opinions to which they allude. In fact this doctrine is alluded to in many of St. Paul's Epistles: it is plainly asserted by St. Peter: and what St. John says in his Epistles, though he views the question in another aspect, is, as I shall attempt to show in the following chapter, perfectly consistent with it. My present business, however, is to examine those passages of Scripture, which speak of the change which we denominate Regeneration in parallel and corresponding expressions.

Regeneration is spoken of in the writings of Theologians either in a larger or a more confined sense. In the works of the ancient Christians it is commonly equivalent to the whole Sacrament of Baptism, including the inward grace and the outward action. Sometimes it signifies the inward grace in its most comprehensive sense; sometimes that part

of it only which consists of a principle of new life. Our Church uses it in this latter sense, when it defines the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism to be *a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness*³; that is, the forgiveness of sin⁴, the ceasing to be sinners, in the divine construction, coupled with an

³ Church Catechism.

⁴ The forgiveness of sin—of original sin, and of all actual sins committed before baptism—is what the ancients principally insist upon, when they speak of regeneration in baptism.

“This death and new birth is neither the resolving to forsake sin and live godly; for this is supposed before baptism, to make the person capable of it: nor the actual forsaking of sin, and living a new life; for that is the consequent task of him that makes a right use of the grace of baptism for his whole life after, and both these an act of the man, wrought the one by the preventing, the other by the assisting grace of God. But this grace of baptism is the strength of Christ, of supernatural ability to forsake sin and live godly, and proportionally a tender of God’s pardon and gracious acceptance, pardon of forsaken sins, and acceptance of imperfect, so it be sincere godliness. And that this is the intention of the Catechism may appear by what follows as the reason of it; *for being by nature born in sin and the children of wrath*, (i. e. born with strong inclinations and propensions to sin, which would certainly engage us in a course of sin, so consequently makes us worthy of wrath,) *we are hereby made children of grace*: i. e. have in baptism that strength given us by Christ that will enable us to get out of that servile and dangerous state.” Hammond’s Practical Catechism. Works, Fol. Vol. i. p. 115.

This is a true explanation of this passage of our Catechism, but it does not seem to me to contain the whole truth. For to be *born in sin*, &c. signifies to be born in a real state of sin and condemnation, and on the other hand, *a death to sin* includes the forgiveness of original and actual sin in baptism.

undertaking, on our part, to mortify continually our corrupt affections, and the grant and earnest of the Holy Ghost, as a principle of spiritual life. But the death to sin and the new birth to righteousness are inseparable, and naturally imply each other, and therefore when the one is mentioned, the other is necessarily understood.

This distinction of our Catechism is founded on the writings of St. Paul, who, in allusion to the sacramental action, describes our Regeneration in Baptism sometimes as a sort of mysterious death and burial, sometimes as a mysterious resurrection. *What shall we say then ? shall we continue in sin, that grace may abound ? God forbid. How shall we who are dead to sin, whose sins have been forgiven us upon the express condition that we will mortify our own sinful lusts, live any longer therein ? Know ye not that as many of you as were baptized into Christ, were baptized into his death ?* into the likeness of his death, and the participation of its benefits. *Therefore we were buried with him by baptism into death : that like as Christ was raised from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life*⁵. This passage contains a plain allusion to the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, and we may infer from it the knowledge and belief of that doctrine in the Roman Church, its general

⁵ Rom. vi. 1—4.

reception, and its conformity to the Apostle's teaching. But though St. Paul here speaks only of the death to sin under these figurative expressions, they necessarily imply and include the new birth to righteousness, because newness of life is declared to be the legitimate and intended effect of this mystical death and burial, and the duty to which they bind and engage us.

In the Epistle to the Ephesians the same mysterious change, and consignation of blessings, are described under the figure of a resurrection, and the Apostle makes use of the same familiar allusion to the sacramental action. *When you were dead in sins, he quickened you together with Christ, and raised you up together with him, and seated you together with him in heavenly places*⁶. But as in the passage just quoted the death to sin implies the new birth to righteousness, so here the resurrection with Christ, or, in other words, the new birth to righteousness, includes the forgiveness of sin.

In the Epistle to the Colossians the same figures are used with the same allusion. *If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God: for ye are dead, and your life is hid with Christ in God*⁷. In passages of this kind, where a supposition is urged as a motive to duty, the hypothetical particle

⁶ Eph. ii. 5, 6.

⁷ Col. iii. 1.

implies no doubt, but carries with it a strong affirmation. "Since you have received in Baptism the forgiveness of your sins and regeneration to life, remember your solemn obligations to lead a new life, to mortify your members which are upon the earth, and to seek those things which are above."

Ye are buried with Christ in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through faith in the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead ⁸.

When the Apostle addresses the converts as men who *had put on Christ*, this expression likewise describes a mystical conformity to Christ, and alludes to their Regeneration in Baptism. For this phrase refers to a past, and, as it appears, a distinct and definite transaction, and not only reminds them of their own promises and professions, because the privileges and obligations of the Christian Covenant are correlatives, and mutually imply each other, but of a determinate change of spiritual and religious existence. What this change is, and when effected, we may learn from St. Paul's words to the Galatians. *Ye are all the children of God through faith in Jesus Christ ; for as many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ* ⁹—have been made one with him and become members of his mystical body, and consequently have been

⁸ Col. ii. 12.

⁹ Gal. iii. 26, 27.

regenerated or made *children of God through faith in Jesus Christ*.

But it must be observed that Baptism is a symbolical action, and that it not only symbolizes the mysterious change wrought in us in the Sacrament, which is its inward and spiritual grace, but the moral and practical change to which it binds us¹. Hence, the same class of figurative expressions, which denote the mystical, frequently denote the practical change likewise. Thus we *die to sin*², or *die with Christ*³ in Baptism because our sins are then forgiven, and we cease to be sinners in God's sight. We *rise again*⁴, because we are then accepted and adopted by God, and made partakers of a principle of spiritual life. We *are crucified with Christ*⁵, we *put on Christ*⁶, or *put on the new man*⁷ in Baptism, because we then become united and conformed to Christ, and are made new creatures in the eye and estimation of God. On the other hand the same, or at least similar phrases, such for instance as to *mortify our members that are upon the earth*⁸, to *crucify the flesh*⁹, to *be made con-*

¹ Quæ symbola in pactis solennibus usurpantur, ea non significandi duntaxat, sed et obligandi etiam gratiâ sunt instituta. Dodwell, Diss. Cyprian. p. 114.

² Rom. vi. 1. ³ Col. ii. 20. ⁴ Col. ii. 12.

⁵ Rom. vi. 6. ⁶ Gal. iii. 27. ⁷ Col. iii. 10.

⁸ Col. iii. 5. ⁹ Gal. v. 24.

*formable to Christ's death*¹, to *put on Christ*², to *put off the old*, and to *put on the new man*³, are used to signify the practical change to which we are bound over in Baptism, and an habitual conformity to the example and practice of Christ.

When, for instance, the converts are *reminded* that they *are dead with Christ*, that they *have risen with Christ*, *are crucified with Christ*, or *have put on Christ*, as an appeal to their faith, or by way of motive to gratitude and obedience, they are referred to the mysterious change, and the grace and privileges received in Baptism, or, in other words, are put in mind of their baptismal Regeneration. When they are exhorted to *mortify their members that are upon the earth*, to *put on Christ*, or to *put on the new man*, they are reminded of that practical change to which they were solemnly obliged in Baptism; or, in other words, of the necessity of acquitting themselves of their religious engagements in the renovation of their inward frame. But the mysterious change, considered in itself, is a change in the sight of God, and is the object of our faith only. The practical change is a practical and progressive change of heart and habits, and is an object of experience and consciousness.

III. The next head of Scriptural authority to which I shall refer consists of texts of Scripture,

¹ Phil. iii. 10.

² Rom. xiii. 14.

³ Eph. iv. 21, 22.

which attribute this change to washing or Baptism, without the intervention of figurative language.

The first and most conclusive of these texts is that in which our Saviour has enjoined his disciples the use of Baptism, and given it the force of a Sacrament by virtue of his word and promise. *Go ye into all the world and preach the Gospel to all creatures. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*⁴. The salvation, which our Lord here promises to baptized believers, is manifestly what *we* call Regeneration—a passage from a state of sin in Adam to a state of grace in Christ—the first entrance into a redeemed and justified life, including the forgiveness of past sins, and a conditional grant of final and everlasting salvation.

Precisely similar to this is St. Peter's assertion. *Baptism doth also now save us (not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God) by the resurrection of Jesus Christ*⁵. The salvation here ascribed to Baptism is equivalent to Regeneration in Baptism. The text contains an allusion to the well-known comparison or analogy between this new birth and Christ's resurrection. And the answer or stipulation of a good conscience toward God, on which this salvation hinges, means in effect the same thing as the faith required by our Saviour. To the same pur-

⁴ Mark xvi. 16.

⁵ 1 Pet. iii. 21.

pose the Apostle thus addresses himself to his countrymen: *Repent and be baptized every one of you for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost*⁶. *Save yourselves from this untoward generation*⁷. “Use without delay the means of salvation which I have pointed out to you, faith in Christ, repentance, and Baptism.” Then, says the historian, *they that gladly received the word were baptized. And afterwards: And the Lord added the saved to the Church daily*⁸. He added to the Church those persons who used the means of salvation enjoined them by the Apostle—received the word gladly, repented and were baptized, and so received remission of their sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost.

Again, in the case of St. Paul, the washing away his sins, and, by necessary implication, his new birth to righteousness, are expressly connected with Baptism. *Arise, and be baptized, and wash away thy sins*⁹.

*We have all of us, says St. Paul, been baptized by one Spirit into one body, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit*¹. “Whether Jews or Gentiles, all we who have been baptized have been born again of the same Spirit, and incorporated into

⁶ Acts ii. 38.

⁷ Acts ii. 40, 41.

⁸ Acts ii. 47. τοὺς σωζομένους. ⁹ Acts xxii. 16.

¹ 1 Cor. xii. 13.

one spiritual body²." And the same Apostle speaks of Christ as purifying and sanctifying the Church (that is, the whole body of believers taken comprehensively, and personified as a religious society) in the water of Baptism, through faith in his word, and the powerful operation of his promise. *Christ loved the Church and gave himself for it, that he might*

² The whole number of believers are represented in Scripture as being, in the order and design of God's counsels, one body, and one Spirit—that is, one body, actuated and informed by one Spirit—*σύνψυχοι, τὸ ἐν φρονοῦντες*. Hence I am inclined to think that the two members or clauses of this passage are parallel, expressing in effect the same thing—and that in the latter 'clause we are to supply *ἐν ἐνὶ πνεύματι* from the former. *We have all of us, (whether Jews or Greeks, bond or free) been baptized by one Spirit into one body*—i. e. so as to become, or, in order that we may become, one body: *and we have all of us been watered or irrigated by one Spirit, or made to drink of one Spirit, into one Spirit*—i. e. so as to become, or, in order that we may become, one Spirit.

So in Eph. iv. 4, St. Paul, I think, speaks of believers, as forming one body and one Spirit. Either, *Ye are one body, and one Spirit, even as ye are called, &c. as there is one Lord, one faith, &c.*, or, *there is one body, and one Spirit*, in the order and design of God's counsels; in other words, 'you believers ought to form one body actuated by one Spirit, *even as you have been called, &c.* The meaning is, that since they have one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, so they themselves, though endowed with a variety of gifts, ought to form one spiritual community—*endeavouring to keep the unity of the Spirit*, unity of affections and sentiments, worship and discipline, *in the bond of peace*. These two passages are parallel, and enforce the same duty.

sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water, by the word ³.

In the language of Theology the word Sanctification has been commonly confined to that progressive improvement which the Holy Spirit produces in the hearts and habits of Christians. But Sanctification, when predicated of moral and religious subjects, signifies more properly a cleansing from pollution, and a separation from the world to God's service. Hence the ancients commonly gave the name of Sanctification to Baptism; and this usage of the word is justified by the Apostle's authority, who ascribes the sanctification of the Church to the washing of water. So in another passage he connects the justification and sanctification of his Corinthian converts with the washing of Baptism. *Know ye not that the unrighteous shall not inherit the kingdom of God?* Then, after enumerating the defilements to which the Gentiles were most prone, he adds, *And such were some of you—but ye have been washed, but ye have been sanctified, but ye have been justified, in the name of our Lord Jesus, and by the Spirit of our God* ⁴. The name in which they had been baptized, the water, the Spirit, the outward sign, and the inward grace of Baptism, are here detailed and brought back to their recollection in the way of solemn warning and admonition.

³ Ephes. v. 25, 26.

⁴ 1 Cor. vi. 9—11.

When, therefore, St. Paul addresses the Roman brethren as *beloved of God, called saints*⁵, and the Corinthians as *sanctified in Christ Jesus, called, saints*⁶; when he speaks of his Ephesian converts as *Saints, whom God had chosen before the foundation of the world to be holy and without blame before him*⁷: and when St. Peter addresses the strangers of Pontus as men *elect through sanctification of the Spirit to obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Christ*⁸; they do not merely use a general phraseology, and express themselves in the language of hope and charity; but they allude to those privileges which had been bestowed on the converts, and certified and assured to their faith in Baptism. For in Baptism every true convert to the faith of Christ was constituted a Saint, and publicly elected into God's household, was sprinkled as it were with the blood of Christ, and sanctified by a special gift of the Spirit, a solemn designation, and a mysterious conveyance of grace, to obedience and a blameless life. *Being born again*⁹, not of the *corruptible seed* of human nature, but of the *incorruptible*¹ seed of the

⁵ Rom. i. 7. ⁶ 1 Cor. i. 2. ⁷ Ephes. i. 1. 4.

⁸ 1 Pet. i. 1, 2.

⁹ 1 Pet. i. 23. 25.

¹ To be *born of incorruptible seed* signifies, I apprehend, the same thing as to be *born of God*, or *born of the Spirit*, and the Spirit is the seed spoken of. Ἐκ σπορᾶς, ἐκ Θεοῦ, ἐκ πνεύματος —but we are thus born διὰ λόγου Θεοῦ, not as the principal or efficient, but as an instrumental cause. It has been argued

Holy Ghost *by the word of God*, (through the instrumentality of his word, and the efficacy of faith in his promise,) *which liveth and endureth for ever. For the word of God*, his promises in Christ, on which the new life and spiritual privileges of believers depend, *endureth for ever.*

IV. The other passages of Scripture, which allude to the same change, and bear a collateral testimony to the doctrine of baptismal Regeneration, may be comprised under one head.

In the writings of the ancient Christians, Baptism is often called, agreeably to St. Paul's language, *a Seal*, and baptized Christians are said to have been sealed. Theologians have likewise in later times applied the same phrase to Baptism, but in a sense different from the Apostle's usage. For they speak

indeed that the seed here mentioned is the word of God, because in the parable of the Sower, the seed is expressly said to be the word of God. But there is no similarity between the cases. In the parable, mankind, or the human soul, is compared to a field, into which the seed or word of God is cast, and either perishes or thrives, according to the soil on which it lights. In this passage, the *incorruptible seed* is spoken of, by a different figure, as a principle of life, communicating a sort of new existence to the human soul. But this principle is either God himself as the principal, or, more properly, the Spirit as the efficient cause of the new birth, or entrance into a new state of spiritual existence.

Some Commentators maintain that the Word here spoken of is the Son of God, the Word that was made flesh, as in John i. 1, and 1 John i. 1.

of it in a legal sense, as a seal annexed or appendant to a charter or covenant; and sometimes enter into discussions upon the virtue of seals annexed to legal instruments, and the nature of the grants confirmed by them. But though Baptism is undoubtedly a token of God's covenant, and *a seal of the righteousness which is by faith*², (that is, a certain sign and solemn confirmation of the forgiveness of sin, and of acceptance with God,) the Apostle does not describe baptism under the figure of a seal annexed to legal instruments, but as a seal affixed to ourselves³; as a ceremony in which we are sealed or stamped with the Spirit, and have as it were a mark set on us inwardly in the soul, as God's peculiar property, in the same manner that the Jews, under the carnal and typical dispensation, were sealed and marked as God's peculiar property outwardly in the flesh. This baptismal consignation is likewise called *an unction*, and *an earnest of the Spirit*⁴; and the Spirit then be-

² Rom. iv. 11.

³ So in Ezekiel ix. 4, a mark (that is, a seal or stamp) is set on the forehead of the faithful, and in the Revelations vii. 3, 4, &c., the servants of God are sealed in their foreheads. This figure of speech is borrowed from the Eastern custom, where a seal is not an impression made on wax, but a stamp made with the seal worn on the finger, (on which the name of the owner is usually engraved,) blackened with ink.

⁴ Quis autem illud dubitet, Baptismi esse proprium officium ut per illum sacris Christianorum initiemur, et in propriam ascribamur Christianorum societatem? Convenit præterea, quod qui confertur in Baptismo Spiritus Sanctus, is ἀρραβὼν (quæ et *arrha*

stowed on us is called *the Spirit of adoption*, because when we are born again of water and of the Spirit, we are born of God, adopted into his family, and publicly declared his children. *He which stablisheth us with you in Christ, and hath anointed us, is God, who hath also sealed us*⁵, hath set his own seal or stamp upon us, *and given us the earnest of his Spirit in our hearts. In whom also after that ye believed, ye were sealed with that Holy Spirit of promise, which is the earnest of our inheritance until the redemption of the purchased possession*⁶. *Grieve not the Holy Spirit of God, whereby ye have been sealed unto the day of redemption*⁷. *Ye have received the Spirit of adoption, whereby we cry, Abba, Father*⁸. *Ye have an unction from the Holy One, and the anointing which ye have received of him abideth in you*⁹.

In these passages the Apostles appeal to the received doctrine of the Church, and the common faith of Christians: and though they may perhaps allude to those miraculous gifts of the Spirit, which were bestowed on many of the first believers, they

est scriptoribus Romanis) in N. T. appelletur. Erat enim in jure Romano arrha pactorum propria. Propria porro est arrha temporis illius quo primo fœdus inimus. Inde sequitur ut de aliâ Spiritûs collatione præterquam baptismali nequeat intelligi. Dodwell, Diss. Cyprianicæ, D. 13. p. 113.

⁵ 2 Cor. i. 21, 22.

⁶ Ephes. i. 13, 14.

⁷ Ephes. iv. 30.

⁸ Rom. viii. 15.

⁹ 1 John ii. 20, 27. *χρίσμα*, that with which you have been anointed, i. e. the Holy Ghost; compare John xvi. 13.

speak principally of that mysterious change of spiritual condition and consignation of the Holy Ghost, which were universally believed to take place in Baptism. Such is the sense which the history and records of the ancient Church affix to these expressions, and I am inclined to think that a sober and dispassionate criticism, and a diligent inquiry into the analogies of Scriptural language and doctrine, will confirm this interpretation.

In the Epistle to the Colossians, St. Paul speaks of Baptism, and illustrates the spiritual change of which it is the instrument, under another figure of the same import—the circumcision of Christ. *In whom ye have been circumcised with the circumcision made without hands, in putting off the body of the sins of the flesh, by the circumcision of Christ*¹, by that sacrament of Christ's appointment, which answers to legal circumcision, and supplies its place, in the way of proportion or analogy, under the Gospel dispensation.—*Having been buried with him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen again with him, through faith of the operation of God, who hath raised him from the dead*².

In this pregnant passage, the efficacy of Baptism is described, and its nature explained and illustrated by the analogy between the Christian and Jewish ordinances. Circumcision was a federal initiation into Judaism, and made over to the circumcised

¹ Col. ii. 11, 12.

² Col. ii. 12.

person a *direct* interest in the blessings and privileges *explicitly* promised in the Mosaic covenant. Baptism is a federal initiation into Christianity, and makes over to the baptized person a similar interest in the blessings and privileges of the Gospel covenant. As every male Israelite was made a member of the congregation, and incorporated into God's chosen people, when he was circumcised; so in Baptism every disciple of Christ, whether male or female, infant or adult, becomes a member of his mystical body, a child of God, and an inheritor of the kingdom of heaven. For Circumcision bore the same analogy to Baptism which the Mosaic dispensation bore to the Christian. It was *the shadow of good things to come, and not the very image of the things*³; and it conveyed no *direct* title to those blessings, which were obscurely shadowed out, but not explicitly promised, in the covenant to which it was appropriated.

It has indeed been often maintained in later times, that Circumcision is the same sacrament with Baptism⁴; that it preached the same doctrine, and

³ Heb. x. 1.

⁴ Quando Sacramentorum utriusque Testamenti idem est auctor, eadem promissiones, eadem veritas, et idem in Christo complementum; meritò dicimus, externis signis inter se differre, in illis autem rebus, quas commemoravi, vel summatim in re ipsâ convenire. Sunt enim doctrinæ appendices. Atqui doctrinæ eadem substantia. Sequitur ergo id quoque in Sacramenta competere. Vulgare est apud Sophistas dogma: Sacramenta Legis

offered and symbolized the same grace under different rites and names ; that the circumcision of the heart was to outward circumcision, what Regeneration is to Baptism, and consequently that Regeneration and the circumcision of the heart are one and the same thing. But this opinion derives no support from Scripture, nor from the writings of the early Christians ; and seems to have arisen from confounding the inward grace of sacraments with their moral import, or those duties and obligations which they imply and enforce. The Apostle indeed, alluding to the typical ceremony, calls our Regeneration in Baptism *a Circumcision not made with hands*, and the ancients often denominate it spiritual Circum-

Mosaicæ figurâsse gratiam, nostra vero exhibere. (We shall find in the following note, who these Sophists are.) Nos autem Deum asserimus semper in suis promissis fuisse veracem : nec quicquam figurâsse ab initio, quod non patribus re ipsâ exhibuerit : nam sub Moyse constabat circumcisionis veritas. Calvin. Ant. S. Sess. p. 296.

But the question is not, whether the doctrine of the Old and New Testament is, or is not, *substantially* the same ; whether God did really bestow the grace of Christ upon the Fathers ; and whether they looked for something more than transitory promises. But whether any *direct* promise of forgiveness of sins and the gift of the Holy Ghost was annexed to their Sacraments ; and whether the Jews were generally taught to believe that such blessings attended upon them. Whether they were, in their plain and literal sense, instruments of spiritual blessings ; or whether the spiritual promises were only typified by the temporal blessings and promises, which they made over *by covenant* to the Israelites.

cision, but there is no identity between these expressions, and the circumcision of the heart mentioned in the Old Testament. The grace, or blessing conveyed by circumcision, consisted in those national and religious privileges, which were the *advantage of the Jew, and the profit of Circumcision* ⁵; and these privileges were analogous to those spiritual blessings which are bestowed on Christians in Baptism, and are signified by the word Regeneration. But the circumcision of the heart, spoken of by Moses and Jeremiah ⁶; the mortification of the corrupt appetites and froward dispositions, and obedience to the will of God; was the moral import of circumcision, or the moral lesson which was grounded on it by the Lawgiver and the Prophet, inspired by the Spirit, and speaking in the name of Jehovah. Lessons of the same kind are suggested by the Christian Sacrament of Baptism, in accordance with the nature and character of the dispensation; and may be called, with much propriety, the moral import of the Ordinance ⁷.

⁵ Rom. iii. 1.

⁶ Jer. iv. 4.

⁷ It is the constant doctrine of the ancient Christians that Judaism was a typical religion; and that the Jewish sacraments, strictly speaking, did not, like the Christian, confer, but only signified and foretold the grace of the Gospel. So Tertullian—*Circumcisio populo Israel data est in signum, non in salutem, in salutis figuram, non in salutis medelam.*

Ambrose (rather the ancient writer whose Commentaries have been ascribed to Ambrose) in Rom. xv. *Circumcisio carnis*

In fine, those passages of the Epistles, which distinguish between the first consignation of grace and

data est in figuram circumcisionis cordis, cujus minister est Christus.

Augustin, Ep. 19. ad Hieron. says, *Sacramenta veterum homines non justificâsse, sed gratiam, quâ justificamur, præ-nuntiâsse, do. In Mem. qu. 5. Si per se attendantur Sacramenta vetera, nullo modo possunt mederi: si autem res ipsæ, quarum hæc sunt Sacramenta, inquirantur, in eis inveniri poterit purgatio peccatorum.*

Augustin, whose notions of Regeneration have been already stated, calls the circumcision of the heart, *puram ab omni illicitâ concupiscentiâ voluntatem*—de Sp. et litera Ambrose Ep. 73. *Litera occidens exiguum corporis portionem; Spiritus intelligens circumcisionem totius animæ corporisque custodit, ut superfluis amputatis, id est peccatis avaritiæ libidinisque vitiis, frugalitas diligatur, et castimonia teneatur.*

In the language of Augustin and the schoolmen, *res sacramenti* does not signify its inward grace, or immediate and mystical effect, but the development of that spiritual principle, its moral and practical effects, which, according to the order of God's counsels and the design of the institution, it is intended to produce.

What he means, therefore, is, that though these Sacraments were not, like the Christian Sacraments, means or channels of forgiveness and spiritual grace; still, if followed up by these things (those graces or virtuous habits, repentance, conversion, &c.) of which they are signs, cleansing from sin, and consequently forgiveness of sin, may be found in them.

There are two circumstances which prove the difference between Circumcision and Baptism.

1. Circumcision was accompanied with no promise of forgiveness of sins, the gift of the Holy Ghost, salvation or eternal life. God indeed declared that the uncircumcised male shall be cut off from the congregation, which was evidently a threat of a

the duties of baptized persons, or between the initiatory gift and earnest of the Holy Ghost, and his abiding influences and effects, may be considered as so many appeals to the faith of the disciples, and indirect testimonies to the truth of this important doctrine. Thus the Roman converts, whom St. Paul had addressed as men who were *dead with Christ*⁸, who had been *justified by faith*, and had *received the Spirit of adoption*, are exhorted to *present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable to God, to be transformed by the renewing of their minds, to cast off the works of darkness, and to put on the armour of light*. Thus the Corinthians, who had been *washed*⁹, *sanctified, and justified, sealed, and anointed*, and endowed with the *earnest of the Spirit*, are called upon to *cleanse themselves from all filthiness of the flesh and of the spirit, and to perfect holiness in the fear of the Lord*. Thus the Apostle beseeches God to bestow *the Spirit of wisdom and revelation*¹ on those Ephesians who had been already *sealed with the Holy Spirit of promise*, and calls upon the

temporal nature. It follows, therefore, that the privileges which it *directly* conferred, were temporal likewise.

2. It was a ceremony, from which females were excluded. The privileges, therefore, which it *directly* bestowed were such as are peculiar to males, and consequently were not of a spiritual nature.

⁸ Rom. vi. 8; v. 1; viii. 15; xii. 1, 2; xiii. 12.

⁹ 1 Cor. vi. 11: 2 Cor. i. 21, 22; vii. 1.

¹ Eph. i. 17; iv. 30; ii. 5, 6, 8; iv. 22, 23, 24.

same men who had been *saved by grace*, and *quickened and raised up together with Christ*, to *be renewed in the spirit of their minds*, to *put off the old*, and to *put on the new man*. Thus to the Colossians, he says, *If ye then be risen with Christ, seek those things which are above, where Christ sitteth at the right hand of God*².

In these passages there is an evident distinction between privileges conferred and obligations contracted; between the mystical and initiatory, and the practical and progressive change of the disciples; between the earnest of the Spirit, and the increase and development of his illuminating and sanctifying graces. The Apostle distinguishes between the grace which they had already received, and the duties to which they had engaged themselves, appeals to their faith, and reminds them of a change, which, as appears from the tenour of his arguments and exhortations, they must have been persuaded that they had actually undergone. But this change was not that practical and progressive improvement, to which he was exciting and encouraging them; it was not a miraculous transformation of heart and faculties, nor a miraculous infusion of habitual holiness: but it was a mysterious change of state and spiritual existence, to which every one of them could refer without doubt or self-delusion, denoted and

² Col. iii. 1.

certified by a visible symbol, exhibited in a Sacrament, received by faith, and confirmed by the promise of the Son of God.

This is that change which, in conformity with Scripture, has been called in the language of the primitive Christians, *Regeneration, a spiritual nativity, a new birth of water and of the Spirit, the washing of regeneration, a death to sin, and a new birth or resurrection to righteousness, a seal, and earnest of the Spirit, spiritual circumcision, the circumcision of Christ, a circumcision not made with hands.* It is a change which the Church has carefully distinguished from conversion, the renewal of the inward frame, and every other change, moral, spiritual, and miraculous; and has not ventured to separate from that Sacrament, with which it has been identified by Christ.

Such is the result of an inquiry into the principal passages of Scripture, on which this primitive and Catholic doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism is founded. From this detailed review of Scriptural authorities we may deduce a few observations.

1. We may observe that, according to the doctrine of Scripture, such a change as that which we denominate Regeneration, does actually take place in Baptism. Christians are represented as receiving the remission of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost in Baptism; as being *saved by baptism, washed, sanctified, and justified*; as being *buried with Christ*

by Baptism into death ; buried and risen again with Christ, in Baptism ; crucified with Christ, putting on Christ in Baptism, sealed and anointed, endowed with the earnest of the Spirit, and the Spirit of adoption ; and circumcised with the circumcision of Christ made without hands. Now all these expressions terminate in a mysterious collation of grace, and a passage from a carnal state in Adam to a spiritual state in Christ ; or in our admission into this latter state, carrying with it the forgiveness of sin, the gift of the Holy Ghost, and a covenanted and conditional title to everlasting happiness.

2. Several of the figures, by which this change is denoted, resemble the expression, Regeneration or the New Birth, and lead us to suppose that they were intended to designate the same change, and to convey the same ideas to our minds. But since these figures speak of a change to which Baptism is instrumental, we reasonably conclude that to be *born again of water and of the Spirit*, and to be *saved by the washing of Regeneration*, signify a change effected through the same medium. And this conclusion is confirmed by a comparison of these figurative passages with those texts of Scripture which connect salvation, the forgiveness of sins, and the gift of the Holy Ghost with Baptism, in plain and literal language. We are therefore fully justified in the use which we make of this word Regeneration, and other words of the same family,

to signify in one comprehensive phrase the spiritual benefits conveyed over to us in the Sacrament of Baptism.

3. In some of the passages recited, Faith (or that *Word*³, which is the object of a Christian faith, and implies faith as its correlative,) and repentance are spoken of in connexion with Baptism, as qualifications for the saving use of it. But, where these qualifications are not mentioned, they are obviously implied and understood. Hence we conclude that faith and repentance are necessary qualifications for Baptism, wherever the subject is capable of them.

4. We must observe that, according to the whole tenour of Scriptural doctrine, Regeneration uniformly implies a strict obligation to newness of life, and improvement in Christian virtues. These are the duties of regenerate man; not the necessary, but the legitimate and intended effects of the New Birth, depending on the right use of the means of grace and spiritual assistance, and the right exercise of that principle of self-action, which God has implanted in us. For what St. Peter says of our Regeneration in Baptism, and first entrance into the Christian state,

³ 1 Pet. i. 23. James i. 18. That *faith* which is “required of persons to be baptized, whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that sacrament,” *cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God.*

applies with equal force to every stage of the life of trial. *Baptism doth save us, not the putting away the filth of the flesh, but the answer of a good conscience toward God*⁴.

⁴ 1 Pet. iii. 21.

CHAPTER V.

A REVIEW OF THE PRINCIPAL OBJECTIONS WHICH HAVE BEEN TAKEN TO THIS DOCTRINE FROM PASSAGES OF SCRIPTURE.

It is a received maxim of Christian wisdom and belief, that there can be no real inconsistency between the several portions of Holy Writ; that they exhibit one scheme and one form of doctrine, and are parts of one great whole, issuing from the same Spirit, and ministering to the same purposes. It happens, however, that in some instances apparent contradictions occur in matters of high import to the soundness of Christian belief. We meet with passages which seem at first sight to militate against other texts, on which the universal Church has grounded established points of doctrine and discipline. We must not be surprised, then, if texts of Scripture are alleged, which appear to some minds

to contradict and confute this doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism. I shall therefore review the most material of those texts, and endeavour to prove, on broad and general principles of interpretation, that they do not in any degree invalidate the doctrine for which I am contending.

Upon those passages which speak of the circumcision of the heart I have already stated my opinion¹. Though the circumcision of the heart may perhaps more properly signify cutting off its evil lusts, and removing the impediments to obedience, its meaning may be so extended as to denote, without any violence to the figure, a renewed and obedient frame of mind. In this sense it is equivalent to Regeneration, in the popular way of speaking; or, in other words², to repentance, renovation, or the change and improvement of the inward frame. This is the great business of the Christian life, the duty to which our Regeneration in Baptism obliges us, and which, by the assistance of the Holy Spirit, we shall be enabled to perform.

But even upon the principles of the greater number of those who dissent from this doctrine, it can scarcely be maintained that Regeneration and the Circumcision of the heart are parallel and equivalent

¹ Particularly Rom. ii. 28, 29.

² Μετάνοια—the change of mind, or inward principles of action.

expressions. For Moses exhorts the people to *circumcise the foreskins of their own hearts* ³; and therefore, when God promises that He will *circumcise their hearts* ⁴, the meaning evidently is, that He will give them grace to circumcise their own hearts, to reform themselves, to renew themselves in the spirit of their minds. But I presume that they, who are most averse to this doctrine, would scarcely exhort their neighbours to regenerate themselves, or allow that to be born again signifies to be endued with grace to reform or regenerate ourselves.

Other passages are alleged, in which men are spoken of as being sons or children of God without any reference to Baptism, and from thence it is concluded, that there is no necessary connection between Baptism and Regeneration. Sons of God, indeed, is a phrase employed in a considerable latitude, and used in a lower sense to denote those who resemble God in some quality or other. But in the stricter sense, of men taken into covenant with God, reconciled to Him through Christ, and endowed with the Spirit of adoption, I certainly conceive that to *be*, or to *be made, children of God*, includes the notion of Baptism. For in this sense of the phrase the *children of God* are *saved*, and since our Lord has declared that *he that believeth and*

³ Deut. x. 16. Jer. iv. 4.

⁴ Deut. xxx. 6.

*is baptized shall be saved*⁵, and since his Apostles have taught us that *we are saved by Baptism and by the washing of Regeneration*⁶, I do not think the conclusion either forced or unreasonable, that Baptism is, in all ordinary cases, necessary to our being *made children of God*; nor can I persuade myself that our Church teaches us, on weak and insufficient grounds, that we are *made children of God in Baptism*.

But in truth this species of negative proof, which has been so much insisted on, is utterly untenable. It is an undeniable rule of interpretation, that in passages which are plainly parallel, what is wanting in one text must be supplied from others that are fuller and more explicit. Thus, since we are taught that we must be *born of water and of the Spirit*, that *Baptism doth save us*, that we are *saved by the washing of Regeneration*, and that *he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*⁷, when we meet with passages in which Christians are said to be *sons of God*, to *become children of God*, to *have been born again*, or to *have been born of God*⁸, without mention of Baptism, it follows that Baptism is *implied*, and *virtually contained*, in these phrases. In fact, if we suppose that our Saviour's precept was strictly com-

⁵ Mark xvi. 16.

⁶ 1 Pet. iii. 21. Titus iii. 5.

⁷ John iii. 5. 1 Pet. iii. 21. Titus iii. 5. Mark xvi. 16.

⁸ 1 John iii. 2. John i. 12, 13. 1 Pet. i. 23. James i. 18.

plied with, and that the expressions connected with it were familiar to the Church, since such phrases as to be *born again*, or to be *born of God*, would naturally suggest the idea of Baptism to the disciples,—the express mention of the sacramental action would be unnecessary. When therefore believers are said to have had *power given them to become the children of God*, and to *have been born of God*; when God is said to have *begotten us with the word of his truth*, and to *have begotten us again to a lively hope*; and when we are said to have been *born again not of corruptible seed but of incorruptible, by the word of God*, according to this sure principle of interpretation, Baptism is *implied* in these passages, as a subordinate and collateral mean of grace; and the negative argument becomes of no value.

But the passages on which the greatest stress is laid are certain texts of St. John's Epistles, which are supposed to confute that connexion which has been thought to subsist between Baptism and Regeneration. For since the Apostle teaches us that *whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin*⁹; ¹ that

⁹ 1 John iii. 9; v. 18; v. 4; v. 1; iv. 7.

¹ It frequently happens that the indefinite and past perfect tenses of the Greek verb (γενένηται, γεννηθῇ, γεγεννημένος) not only signify a past and particular action, but a permanent act consequent upon it; and imply the natural or moral effects of that action, and a continuance in the state of which it is the commencement. So the words *δικαιωθέντες, καταλλαγέντες, Χριστῷ*.

whatsoever is born of God overcometh the world; that every one that loveth is born of God; and that whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ is born of God; from hence it is argued, that they in whom these signs concur are regenerate, whether baptized or not; that they, on the contrary, in whom these signs are not to be found, though they may have been baptized with water, have not been born again of the Spirit.

We may, however, suppose with good reason, that the Apostle did not intend to invalidate his Master's lesson, or to derogate from his institution. Whatever may be the true meaning of the word Regeneration, to *be saved* and to *be born again* are *συνεσταύρωμαι*, imply a continuance in that state into which the parties had been admitted. Thus these expressions of St. John not only denote the new birth, but a continuance in that state of new life, of which the new birth is the commencement. This expression, therefore, "*he that hath been born of God,*" is equivalent to the expressions, *he that abideth in God*, and *a child of God*, even on grammatical principles. In order to express this sense in our own idiom, we must make use of a periphrasis—*He that hath been born of God, and continues to be a child of God*. We must of course decide from the nature of the argument, and a general view of the passages before us, when the past tense implies continuance, and signifies a permanent act. The grounds on which this sense is assigned to it in the present case, will be seen in the body of the work.

Rosenmuller calls this use of the past perfect tense an Hebraism: but I am inclined to think that it is a Grecism likewise. Indeed, it is an usage which, though it may be more common in a tongue which has no present tense, seems to arise out of the general nature and use of language.

parallel expressions in the texts quoted in the last chapter. But since Christ has taught us that *he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*, it seems not very probable that St. John intended to say, that he who believes is regenerated or saved, whether baptized or not; or that those other qualifications can, according to the ordinary tenour of the Gospel Covenant, entitle man to salvation independently of Baptism.

But since these texts have been alleged with much confidence in confutation of the opinion which I am advocating, I shall not content myself with this general reply to the negative proof, but shall explain them more at large, in order to show that they are perfectly consistent with the doctrine which connects, and, in a qualified sense, identifies Regeneration with Baptism.

When we meet with texts of Scripture containing opinions apparently contradictory, they cannot both be assumed as grounds of reasoning, in their simple and literal construction, but they may usually be reconciled to each other upon general and approved principles of interpretation. For instance—If the contending passages are both of a controversial nature, an acquaintance with the opposite errors, which the inspired writers were combating, will probably bring them to an agreement. If the one is direct and dogmatical, the other controversial, it is evident that the dogmatical passage must furnish

the key to the controversial. This therefore is one simple method of reconciling such differences. We must enter into the drift and intention of the writers: we must consider, for instance, whether they are laying down and explaining any particular doctrine, or alluding to it as a well-known and received opinion; or are combating errors which had been grafted on it. And we must attend to the circumstances and positions of the parties, to whom they originally addressed themselves.

On this ground, if I mistake not, notwithstanding what St. John has written, we may safely adhere to the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, which was maintained by the ancient Christians. For those passages, which they assumed as grounds and first principles, are either intended to propound and explain the doctrine directly and dogmatically, or to remind the disciples of what they had already learned and believed, for purposes of practical improvement. On the other hand these texts of St. John appear from the contents and texture of the Epistle to be of a controversial nature, intended to combat a pernicious misconstruction of what our Saviour and his Apostles had taught.

Though we cannot exactly determine what persons and opinions the Apostle was combating, it appears certain, to use the words of an eminent Divine, "that he has written a large part of his first Epistle to confute some men of his own time, who

boasted that they had been born of God, while they took no care to maintain good works²,”—Men who perverted the received and orthodox notions of Regeneration to the worst purposes, and laid claim to the privileges and blessings of the Gospel Covenant, while they were dispensing with its obligations, and despising its sanctions.

Little doubt can, I think, be entertained that this is a true statement of the general drift of the Apostle's letter, and that what he has said on this particular subject was intended to correct a dangerous misconception of a current and catholic doctrine. But if Christ and his Apostles had taught that Regeneration is a radical and entire change of the mind and moral nature, and consequently, that in the eye of reason, and the nature of things, a sound faith and habitual holiness are the only evidences of a new birth, the misconception would have been almost impossible, and the heresy would have confuted and condemned itself. If, on the other hand, their doctrine was the same which we find in the writings of the early Christians, men of corrupt minds would easily be induced to separate the grace and privileges of Baptism from the qualifications which they pre-suppose, and the duties and obligations which they imply. They would endeavour to persuade themselves and their fellow Chris-

² Waterland on Regeneration.

tians, that he who has been once mystically grafted into Christ, will *abide* in Christ for ever; that he who has once *known* God, will *know* Him to the end intimately and vitally; and that he who has *been born of God* in a sacramental and mysterious manner, will never cease to be the child of God.

The Apostle therefore secures the sound part of his converts against the infection of this heresy, by carrying their thoughts from the blessings and privileges to the duties and obligations of Christianity, and insisting on their inseparable union. *To have fellowship with the Father and the Son, to abide in the light, to abide in the Father and the Son, to know Christ, to have, to see, to know the Father, and to be the sons of God*³, are different phrases which express in significant language the great privilege of our religion; a mysterious union with the Deity, and a spiritual relationship to God and Christ. But since this union implies and requires a moral resemblance, it will necessarily go to decay and expire without the exercise of the corresponding duties. These are, a sincere faith in Jesus as the Christ and the Son of God⁴, and a resolute confession of the Father and the Son⁵; a stedfast attachment to the word

³ 1 John i. 3. 7; ii. 10; ii. 24. 27, 28; iii. 6; iv. 13. 15, 16; ii. 23. 2 John 9. 3 John 11. 1 John ii. 4; iii. 24; iv. 7; iii. 1; v. 20.

⁴ 1 John v. 1. 5.

⁵ 1 John iv. 2, 3. 15. 2 John 7.

of truth⁶, love and fellowship with each other⁷, walking as Christ walked⁸, an unfeigned obedience to the commandments of God and Christ⁹, and a life of righteousness and purity¹.

As therefore the whole tenor of the Epistle shows that St. John is not teaching us how we are to acquire our Christian privileges, but how we are to preserve them, so it will satisfy an attentive reader that, in the passages which bear upon this question, he is not pointing out to us the tests of Regeneration, but the criterions by which we must learn whether we are indeed God's children in a practical point of view, *walking in the light, and abiding in the Father and the Son*. In other words, whether the principle of new life bestowed on us in Baptism, is expanding and developing itself in a virtuous and godly conversation. With this clue to our enquiry we shall find that these passages are so far from contradicting the doctrine of baptismal Regeneration that they evidently imply and pre-suppose it.

1. It forms a strong presumption in favour of this view of the texts before us, that the points on which they insist are the substance of the baptismal

⁶ 1 John ii. 5. 14. 22, 23. 27.

⁷ 1 John ii. 9, 10; iii. 14. 16. 23; iv. 8. 11. 16. 20, 21; v. 1, 2.

⁸ 1 John ii. 6.

⁹ 1 John ii. 3, 4; iii. 22. 24; v. 3.

¹ 1 John ii. 29; iii. 3. 7.

engagements, which were required of Catechumens, and assented to in the name of Infants, in the earliest ages of the Church—a profession of faith in Christ, a renunciation of the devil, and, by implication, of the world, and a promise of subjection to the will and commandments of God. But these engagements, solemnly undertaken in Baptism, extend to every portion of the Christian and probationary state. Whilst they are faithfully kept, the spiritual life, commenced mysteriously in the Sacrament, advances practically and experimentally. When they are neglected and broken, the salutary effects of the new birth cease, till they are recovered by repentance; and we are no longer numbered with the children of God.

2. It must be remarked that the same effects which the Apostle attributes in these passages to our having been *born of God*, are ascribed by him in other places of the same Epistle to our *abiding in the light, knowing God*², *abiding in God*³, *dwelling in God, and God in us*⁴. If he teaches us that *whosoever hath been born of God does not commit sin*⁵, he likewise teaches us that *whosoever abideth in him, sinneth not*⁶. If he teaches us that *whosoever hath been born of God does not commit sin, because his seed* (i. e. his Spirit) *abideth in him*, he likewise

² 1 John ii. 10.

³ 1 John ii. 4 ; iii. 24 ; ii. 6, &c.

⁴ 1 John iii. 24 ; iv. 12, 15, 16.

⁵ 1 John iii. 9.

⁶ 1 John iii. 6.

teaches us that *he that keepeth his commandments dwelleth in God and God in him*⁷, and that *hereby we know that he abideth in us, by his Spirit* (by the fruits and evidences of his Spirit) *which he hath given us*. If he teaches us that *whosoever loveth hath been born of God*⁸, he teaches us that *he that loveth abideth in the light*⁹; and that *he that dwelleth in love dwelleth in God, and God in him*¹. If he teaches us that *he that believeth that Jesus is the Christ hath been born of God*², he likewise teaches us that *whosoever shall confess that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him and he in God*³.

Since then in this Epistle the phrase to “have been born of God” signifies the same thing as to “abide in the light,” to “know God,” to “abide in God,” to “dwell in God and God in us,” we must either so far identify the commencement and continuance of the Christian life, the spiritual birth and the spiritual life, as to affirm that the one is the inseparable and indefectible consequence of the other—a position contrary to the whole tenor of our religion, to the Apostle’s doctrine, and to the express drift and purpose of this Epistle—or we must allow that the phrase is here used in an enlarged sense, (expressing the continuance as well as the commencement of the spiritual life,) with a view to a

⁷ 1 John iii. 24.

⁸ 1 John iv. 7.

⁹ 1 John ii. 10.

¹ 1 John iv. 16.

² 1 John v. 1.

³ 1 John iv. 15.

particular controversy, and the correction of a dangerous error; that consequently the effects which he ascribes to the mystical new birth are not its necessary and inseparable, but its legitimate and intended consequences; and that the tests to which he remits us are not, strictly speaking, the criterions of our Regeneration, or new birth, but of our continuance and advancement in the spiritual and new life, of our abiding and dwelling in God, and of his abiding and dwelling in us.

3. But a brief explanation of the texts in question will render this assertion still more evident.

Whosoever hath been born of God ⁴, to any salutary and lasting purpose; he who has not only been born again of water and of the Spirit, but is still the child of God by a spiritual union and relationship—in other words, he who *dwelleth in God and God in him, doth not commit sin*, doth not give his mind to sin nor addict himself to the practice of it, *because his seed* (the same Spirit, whose mysterious earnest was bestowed on him in Baptism) *abideth in him* ⁵, leavening the whole lump, and transforming the whole inner man: and, when this is the case, *he cannot sin* ⁶, morally speaking, *because he hath been*

⁴ 1 John iii. 9.

⁵ The Spirit is said to dwell in us, when he is working in or exerting a saving influence upon our souls.

⁶ He cannot be living in a habit of sin, or commit any such sin as is unto death.

born of God. For as abstinence from sin is the duty of the new born creature, so a life of sin is contrary to the purposes and obligations of the new birth, and is a state directly opposite to the state of a real Christian, and destructive of every Christian privilege.

*Whatsoever hath been born of God*¹, profitably and effectually, *overcometh the world*; is strenuously engaged in combating and overcoming the world; and *this is the victory which overcometh the world, even our faith.* For Regeneration in Baptism always supposes a renunciation of the world; and that victory over the world, which is wrought by faith, is the *legitimate* and *intended* consequence of having been born of God, and an obligation which the new birth imposes on every Christian.

*Whosoever believeth that Jesus is the Christ*², and *whosoever loveth, hath been born of God*; he is leading that spiritual life which is the proper effect of the new birth in the order of God's counsels; or, in other words, he *abideth in the light*, and *abideth in the Father and the Son.* For, since faith in Jesus, as the Christ and the Son of God, is a main qualification for the salutary effects of Baptism, and a material branch of the sacramental profession and promise; and since the love of our brethren, comprehending one great division of God's commandments, is

¹ 1 John v. 4.

² 1 John v. 1; iv. 7.

another part of our solemn vows and engagements; if our faith in Christ should become unsound or unfruitful, or if our love to our brethren should wax cold, we cannot, with any show of reason, lay claim to the privileges, nor even to the name of God's children.

This, I conceive, is a just view of these passages of Scripture; and they are so far from contradicting the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, that they appear to me to imply and pre-suppose it, and to give evidence of its reception as an established article of faith in the days of the Apostle.

Upon the whole, then, we may conclude, 1. That the phrases, to be *born again*, to be *born of God*, and the corresponding expressions, are used in their appropriate sense, when applied to the Sacrament of Baptism, both as a sign, and as a means or instrument of grace, symbolical of our mystical death and resurrection, and actually conveying over to us our spiritual nativity, the pardon of sin, and the mysterious earnest of the Holy Ghost.

2. That there is nothing in the Apostle's words which can allow us to separate Regeneration from Baptism, or to affirm of any *living* disciple of Christ that he has been *born again*, *born of God*, or *born of the Spirit*, previously to this Sacrament.

3. That in the passages which have been examined, the phrase, *to have been born of God*, is used in an enlarged sense to signify the continuance as

well as the commencement of the spiritual life, in order to confute the pernicious tenets which had been grafted on the doctrine of Regeneration, and to fix the attention of the disciples on the duties and obligations of their baptismal covenant.

For in those passages of Scripture, in which this or similar phrases are used in their appropriated and restricted sense, the doctrine is stated and explained, and the solemn rite to which Regeneration, as a covenant blessing, is tied down, is either insisted on, or plainly alluded to. In these texts nothing is said of the outward means or instrument of Regeneration, which were well known to the disciples, and were necessarily implied and understood; but our attention is drawn to the qualifications which it requires, to its moral import, and the practical effects which it was intended to produce; without which, as is allowed on all hands, it will lose its virtues, and become *a savour of death unto death* ⁹.

Ye know that he was manifested to take away our sins; and in him is no sin. Whosoever abideth in him sinneth not: whosoever sinneth, hath not seen him, neither known him. Little children, let no man deceive you: he that doeth righteousness is righteous, even as he is righteous. He that committeth sin is of the devil; for the devil sinneth from the beginning. For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might

⁹ 2 Cor. ii. 16.

*destroy the works of the devil. Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, for his seed remaineth in him, and he cannot sin, because he is born of God. In this the children of God are manifest, and the children of the Devil: whosoever doeth not righteousness is not of God, neither he that loveth not his brother*¹.

¹ 1 John iii. 5, &c.

CHAPTER VI.

A VIEW OF THE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION TAUGHT
BY THE CHURCH OF ENGLAND.

WHEN our Reformers settled the discipline, reviewed the doctrine, and compiled the liturgy of our national Church, they wisely determined to make no unnecessary changes, nor to introduce any novelty in religion, but to place every thing, as much as possible, on the same footing on which it stood before the corruptions, which they were removing, had found their way into the Church of Christ. Hence they did not sit down to the study of the Scriptures with a view of extracting from them a new form of doctrine or discipline, but they brought every question in debate to the test of Scripture, and allowed no conclusion to be valid, unless it was, as they were persuaded, fully borne out by the authority of the Sacred Volume. They likewise diligently enquired

into the writings of the ancient Christians, and having satisfied themselves upon the common principles of experience and investigation, that the doctrines *universally* received in the Churches in their days were agreeable to the truth, they were so far from refusing the assistance which they furnished them in the compilation of our Articles and Liturgy, that they avowedly acted on the principle of conforming as much as possible to their opinions and phraseology¹.

The doctrine of Regeneration maintained by the early Christians has been already stated. That Regeneration is made over to us in baptism, in the ordinary course of the Gospel dispensation, is an opinion which the universal Church and all orthodox writers had held without any doubt or variety of sentiment, till the era of the Reformation. We may therefore expect to find the same doctrine taught in our Articles and Liturgy: and we have reason to think that our Reformers would have rejected at once any novel opinions², “which the

¹ Accessimus autem, quantum maxime potuimus, ad Ecclesiam Apostolorum et veterum Catholicorum Episcoporum et Patrum, quam scimus adhuc fuisse integram—nec tantum doctrinam nostram, sed etiam *Sacramenta*, precumque publicarum formam ad illorum ritus et instituta direximus. Inde enim putavimus instaurationem petendam esse, unde prima religionis initia ducta essent. Juelli Apologia, p. 184, Ench. Theol. 8vo, 1812.

² Imprimis vero videbunt concionatores, ne quid unquam doceant pro concione, quod a populo religiose teneri et credi velint, nisi quod consentaneum sit doctrinæ Veteris aut Novi

Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops had not gathered from the doctrine of Scripture." Accordingly, when we consult these documents, we find that they make use of their phraseology, and adopt their opinions, which are in fact plain and obvious deductions from Scripture, unwarped by fanciful interpretations and religious prejudices³.

The first Article⁴ which alludes to this doctrine, is that which treats of original or birth sin. In this Article we are taught that "this infection of nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerate:" and that "although there is no condemnation to them that believe and are baptized, yet the Apostle doth confess that concupiscence or lust hath in itself the nature of sin." In this sentence the word *renatis* (or regenerate) in the Latin copy answers to the

Testamenti, quodque ex eâ ipsâ doctrinâ Catholici Patres et Veteres Episcopi collegerint. Canons, 1570.

On this Canon it may be remarked—that the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops did uniformly collect from Scripture that doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, which our Articles and Liturgy appear to common understandings to inculcate: and that they never did collect from Scripture the doctrine which has been substituted for it, and which its advocates have attempted to reconcile to the plain statements of our Liturgy.

³ Many of the prayers contained in our Service-book are the same, or nearly the same, as were in use previous to the Reformation. It appears that the compilers of our Liturgy were anxious to retain such portions of the ancient services, as were consistent with sound doctrine, and free from the corruptions of the Church of Rome.

⁴ Article ix.

word baptized in the English, which plainly shows that our Reformers, in conformity to the ancient doctrine, identified Regeneration with Baptism. We arrive at the same conclusion from considering the state of the controversy. For this part of the Article is pointed at the doctrine of the Roman Church, established by the Council of Trent, that the whole infection of original sin is washed away and the soul rendered altogether pure in Baptism ⁵.

The fifteenth Article, speaking of Christ alone

⁵ Si quis per Christi gratiam, quæ in Baptismo confertur, reatum originalis peccati remitti negat; aut etiam asserit non totum tolli id, quod veram ac propriam peccati rationem habet, sed illud tantum dicit radi, aut non imputari, Anathema sit.— Veterem hominem exuentes, et novum, qui secundum Deum creatus est, induentes, innocentes, immaculati, puri, innoxii, ac Deo dilecti, effecti sunt Dei hæredes, &c. Concupiscentiam, quam aliquando Apostolus peccatum vocat, Sancta Synodus declarat Ecclesiam Catholicam nunquam intellexisse peccatum appellari quod vere ac proprie peccatum sit, sed quia ex peccato est, et ad peccatum inclinat. Primum Decretum Quintæ Sessionis.

Paolo tells us that the Theologians of the Council agreed, that original sin is effaced by Baptism, which renders the soul as pure as it was in the state of innocence, though the penalties of that sin remain to serve as exercises to the faithful. 1. 2. § 65.

The opinion of the ancients is conformable to the doctrine of our Church. Lex ista peccati, quæ in membris est corporis mortis hujus, et remissa est regeneratione spiritali, et manet in corpore mortali. Remissa, quia reatus solutus est sacramento; manet autem, quia operatur desideria, contra quæ dimicant et fideles. Augustin contra Julianum.

without sin, says, "All we the rest, although baptized, and born again in Christ, yet offend in many things:" evidently speaking of our Regeneration in Baptism.

In the next Article likewise, which treats of sin after Baptism, it is assumed, in conformity to the doctrine of the universal Church, that "we receive the Holy Ghost in Baptism."

In the twenty-fifth Article Sacraments are defined to be "not only badges or tokens of Christian men's profession, but rather certain sure witnesses and efficacious signs of grace, and God's good will towards us." This is precisely the doctrine which the ancient Christians held—that Sacraments are not only signs significant or symbolical, but signs accompanied with a conveyance of grace, and a saving efficacy upon the soul; and that they are sure witnesses, testimonies, pledges, and securities, of God's present and actual, and lasting good will toward us.

In the twenty-seventh Article we are taught that Baptism is not only a sign of profession, or "a mark of difference, but also a sign," an efficacious sign, "of Regeneration or new birth," a sign through means of which the inward grace of Regeneration is actually bestowed on us, in virtue of Christ's institution and promise; "whereby, as by an instrument," after the manner of a legal instrument, which makes over to a man the freedom of a public body, or his

title to any property or privilege, "they that receive Baptism rightly," from the proper hands and with proper qualifications, "are grafted into the Church ; the promises of forgiveness of sins, and of our adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost, are visibly signed and sealed," are openly ratified and made good to us, as it were by the signing and sealing of a deed or instrument. "Faith is confirmed and grace is increased," in those recipients who are capable of an increase of faith and grace, "by virtue of prayer unto God. The Baptism of young children is in any wise to be retained in the Church as most agreeable to the institution."

In this part of the Article there can be no reasonable doubt that the meaning of the Church is (a point never doubted among orthodox Christians previous to the time of the Reformation), that every individual Infant, receiving "Baptism rightly," partakes of those graces of which Infants are capable—the new birth, incorporation into Christ, forgiveness of sin, and adoption to be the sons of God by the Holy Ghost. For, independently of the argument for Infant Baptism drawn from the analogy between Christian Baptism and Jewish Circumcision, Baptism was instituted for the salvation of sinners ; and since Infants are born in sin and stand in need of forgiveness, and are capable of grace and salvation, it is most agreeable to the institution that they should be baptized, in order

that they may partake of the Gospel promise, and be saved or regenerated, without respect of persons, in the way which Christ has appointed.

In the different offices for the Administration of Baptism, the same doctrine is taught with particularity and plainness, and a studied conformity to the language and opinions of the ancient Christians. Previous to the sacramental act, the person to be baptized is represented as not regenerate; but from the moment that the ceremony has been performed, he is pronounced regenerate, without a hint or suspicion of any reserve, or of any doubt existing in the minds of either the Minister or the Congregation. We are first told that "all men are conceived or born in sin," and that "none can enter into the kingdom of God unless they be regenerate, and born anew of water and of the Spirit;" and are therefore besought to call upon God that the Infant "may be baptized with water and with the Holy Ghost." Accordingly, the Congregation joins with the Minister in praying, "that he, coming to God's Holy Baptism, may receive remission of his sins by spiritual Regeneration, and that God will give his Holy Spirit to him, that he may be born again, and made an heir of everlasting salvation:" and God is intreated to "sanctify the water to the mystical washing away of sin." As soon as the Child has been baptized, and received into the Congregation, the Minister solemnly pronounces him "regenerate, and

grafted into the body of Christ," and the Congregation returns thanks to God, for having been "pleased to regenerate him with his Holy Spirit, to receive him for his own child by adoption, and to incorporate him into his Holy Church."

In the office for receiving Children privately baptized into the Church, instead of praying God to "give his Holy Spirit to the Infant that he *may be* born again," we beseech Him to "give the Infant his Holy Spirit, that he, *being* born again," that is, having been already born again, when he was baptized, "may continue his servant and attain his promises:" plainly expressing our firm persuasion that Baptism is the point in which the new birth takes place.

In short, these Offices, from one end to the other, unequivocally exhibit that same doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, which has been stated in a preceding chapter; and are compiled in strict conformity to the language and sentiments of the ancient Churches. Indeed, the views which they present to us of the connexion between the Sacrament and the new birth, and of the opinion of our Reformers on this head of doctrine, are most clear and explicit, and appear scarcely to leave any opening for cavils and disputes upon the subject.

In the Catechism it is affirmed that we "are made members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven in Baptism:" that a

Sacrament is "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given unto us," and that this sign or sacrament is "ordained by Christ himself as a means," that is, an instrumental cause, or instrument of conveyance, "whereby we receive the same" inward grace, "and a pledge to assure us" of its collation; and that the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism is "a death unto sin and a new birth unto righteousness;" the forgiveness of sin, implying the promise of power to resist and overcome it, and the gift of the Holy Ghost as the principle of the new life of righteousness. In proof of this, we are reminded that "being by nature born in sin, and children of wrath, we are made children of grace," children of God, and partakers of his grace, by Baptism. For if we are born in sin and children of wrath, we cannot become children of grace by Baptism, unless we receive the forgiveness of sin and a new principle of righteousness, in the right use of that Sacrament.

In the Office of Confirmation ⁶, the Regeneration

⁶ There are some passages in the writings of Cyprian, which would seem to imply that, though forgiveness of sin and spiritual Regeneration are conferred in Baptism, the gift of the Holy Ghost is, more properly speaking, bestowed by laying on of hands. But since in other passages of his works he positively states that we are born again of the Spirit, and renewed by the Spirit, in Baptism, he can only mean that the gift of the Holy Ghost, which is bestowed in Baptism, is increased and strengthened by imposition of hands. He uses indeed a phrase, which shows the great importance that he attached to this ceremony—*Sacramento utroque*

of the parties before the Bishop, and the forgiveness of their sins in Baptism, are directly and unequivocal

nascuntur—intimating that, in his opinion, the new birth could not be deemed complete without Episcopal imposition of hands, or, as it is commonly called, Confirmation.

Quod nunc quoque apud nos geritur, ut qui in Ecclesiâ baptizantur, præpositis Ecclesiæ offerantur, ut per nostram orationem et manûs impositionem Spiritum Sanctum consequantur, et signaculo dominico consummentur.

Afterwards, expressing his disapprobation of the opinion that heretics might be received into the Church by imposition of hands only, without Ecclesiastical Baptism, he says:—Ideo baptizari eos oportet, qui de hæresi ad Ecclesiam veniunt, ut qui legitimo et vero et unico Sanctæ Ecclesiæ Baptismo ad regnum Dei Regeneratione divinâ præparantur, *sacramento utroque nascantur*, quia scriptum est: Nisi quis renatus fuerit ex aquâ et Spiritu, non potest intrare in regnum Dei. Ep. ad Jubaianum, 73.

Upon this dictum of Cyprian, Mr. Faber makes this extraordinary comment:

“Cyprian scruples not to speak of the Sacrament of Baptism as being a two-fold Sacrament: that is to say, as being a Sacrament including in its Ideality two distinct Sacraments, which might or might not be received simultaneously,—*Regeneration from water, or a federal change of condition; and Regeneration from the Spirit, or a moral change of condition.*”

It is difficult to understand how Mr. Faber could stumble on this strange mistake. Nothing can be more evident than that Cyprian does not here speak of Baptism as a two-fold Sacrament, but by Sacramentum utrumque means Baptism, and the imposition of hands.

The same argument occurs in his Epistle to Stephen, 72.

Dr. Hammond observes:—

Nobis extra omne dubium ponitur Spiritum Domini in Baptismo dari, (nec enim aliter verum esset ex aquâ et Spiritu nasci,)

cally asserted: "Almighty God, who hast vouchsafed to regenerate these thy servants by water and the

cujus tamen largioribus rivis homines in Confirmatione proliui ac perfundi æque non dubitamus. De Confirmatione, vol. i. p. 892.

The following passage he quotes from Eucherius de Gubernatione Dei, as expressing the common sentiments of the ancient Christians.

Spiritus Sanctus qui super aquas Baptismi salutifero descendit illapsu, in fonte plenitudinem tribuit ad innocentiam, in Confirmatione gratiam præstat ad augmentum. In Baptismo regeneramur ad vitam, post baptismum confirmamur ad pugnam. In Baptismo abluimur, post baptismum roboramur. Regeneratio per se salvat mox in pace beati sæculi recipiendos: Confirmatio armat ac instruit ad agones mundi hujus et prælia reservandos. p. 895.

Besides the passages quoted in Chapter 8, from Cyprian, to show that in his opinion the Holy Ghost is given in Baptism, the following are decisive of his sentiments:—

Per baptismum enim accipitur Spiritus Sanctus, et sic a baptizatis, et Spiritum Sanctum consecutis, ad bibendum calicem Domini pervenitur. Ep. 63. ad Cæcilium.

Peccata purgare, et hominem sanctificare aqua sola non potest, nisi habeat et Spiritum Sanctum. Quare aut et Spiritum necesse est concedant esse illic, ubi baptismum esse dicunt; aut nec baptismum est, ubi Spiritus non est, quia baptismum esse sine Spiritu non potest. Ep. 74. Pompeio.

In the same Epistle, speaking of receiving the Holy Ghost by the imposition of hands, he says: Porro autem *non* per manus impositionem quis nascitur quando accipit Spiritum Sanctum, sed in Baptismo, ut Spiritum jam natus accipiat, sicut in primo homine Adam factum est. Ante enim Deus eum plasmavit, et tunc insufflavit in faciem ejus spiritum vitæ. Nec enim potest accipi Spiritus, nisi prius fuerit qui accipiat.

But though there is an apparent inconsistency in these pas-

Holy Ghost, and hast given them forgiveness of all their sins; strengthen them, we beseech thee, with the Holy Ghost the Comforter⁷." And precisely in the same manner, we intreat God in the Collect for Christmas Day, that "we being regenerate," that is, *having been* born again, and made his children by adoption and grace, "may be daily renewed by his Holy Spirit." For, since our Liturgy every where teaches and assumes our adoption and Regeneration in Baptism, and never uses the word except in reference to Baptism, the supposition that in this prayer the congregation is contemplated as unregenerate, and that we are praying for some other Regeneration and adoption, is totally inconsistent with sound and just principles of interpretation.

We find, then, that our Liturgy, in strict conformity to the doctrine of the universal Church,

sages, it was always the doctrine of the Church, grounded on plain texts of Scripture, that the Holy Ghost is received in Baptism.

⁷ This prayer is one of great antiquity, and is found in the Sacramentary of Gelasius (A.D. 494), of Gregory, and many of the Western Churches. Palmer's *Origines Liturgicæ*, vol. ii. p. 203.

Consequently, it was used when Confirmation immediately followed Baptism, and was considered as a kind of supplement to that Sacrament. Martene tells us that this custom, though still retained in some places, had gone into general disuse about the beginning of the thirteenth century. Martene de *Antiquis Ecclesiæ Ritibus*, vol. i. c. 2, p. 86.

makes no mention of Regeneration except in conjunction with Baptism; and that its compilers were so far from attempting to separate what had been intimately connected in the faith and discipline of their forefathers in Christianity, that they have never introduced the word into these services even in a popular sense. The learned Archbishop of Cashel has investigated the genealogy of these Offices, and shown that this doctrine pervades all those documents from which we can infer their true drift and import, on legitimate principles of analogy and induction. He has traced the doctrine which they exhibit to the writings of Cranmer, the two books of Homilies⁸, the paraphrase of Erasmus, the

⁸ In the Homilies this doctrine is evidently assumed, and often asserted and alluded to.

Insomuch that Infants, *being baptized* and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice (*i. e.* the sacrifice of the death of Christ, on which the efficacy of Baptism, and all other means of grace, ultimately depends) washed from their sins, brought to God's favour, made his children, and inheritors of his kingdom of heaven. And they which in act or deed do sin after Baptism, are by this sacrifice washed from their sins. Homily on Salvation, p. 1, 17. London Edition, 1817.

Here it is assumed that Infants are, in virtue of Christ's sacrifice, washed from their sins in Baptism; and the distinction between the forgiveness of sins in Baptism, and subsequently to it, is laid down.

So again at the latter end of the First Part of the same Homily:—

And therefore we trust to obtain thereby God's grace and remission, *as well of our original sin in Baptism*, as of all actual

works of Luther, and the public services of the Lutheran Church. As we ascend higher, the line of testimony continues unbroken, and the doctrine of Regeneration in and through Baptism, as a necessary Article of Christian faith, grounded on our Saviour's express declaration, may be traced backward without interruption from the time of the Reformation to the days of the Apostles.

It is true that we find many Divines of our Church departing more or less from the language or

sin committed by us *after Baptism*, if we truly repent and turn unfeignedly to Him again. p. 23.

"The fountain of our Regeneration (λουτρὸν παλιγγενεσίας) is there presented unto us." Homily of repairing of Churches, p. 251.

Our Saviour Christ altered and changed the same (*i. e.* the Jewish washings) into a profitable Sacrament, the Sacrament of our Regeneration, or new birth. Homily on Fasting, p. 266.

We be therefore washed in our Baptism from the filthiness of sin, that we should live afterward in the pureness of life. Homily on the Passion, p. 385.

By holy promises, with calling the name of God to witness, we be made *lively members of Christ*, when we profess his religion, receiving the Sacrament of Baptism. Homily on Swearing, p. 62.

These passages of the Homilies present us with exactly the same view of the effects of Baptism which pervades the writings of the ancient Christians. Baptism is called the Fountain and Sacrament of our Regeneration, and we are said to be washed from the filthiness of sin, and made lively members of Christ in Baptism. But at the same time the necessity of living in pureness of life, and of repenting truly of sins committed after Baptism, are distinctly insisted on.

the doctrine of these formularies, and led by the fashion of the day, and their deference to the opinions of some foreign Theologians of eminence, to relinquish the sentiments and phraseology of Christian antiquity. But the greater number of those Divines, who have been most distinguished for their intimate acquaintance with the history of ecclesiastical opinion, a sound judgment, and a vigorous understanding, though they may have sometimes used the word Regeneration in an enlarged and popular sense, have adhered to the primitive doctrine, and enforced it with the whole weight of their learning, talents, and eloquence⁹.

From a review then of our Articles and Liturgy we may derive the following conclusions.

1. They maintain the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism in the most decided manner, grounding it on the same texts of Scripture, from which the ancient Christians had deduced it; including under it forgiveness of sin, the gift of the Holy Ghost, and the inheritance of the kingdom of heaven: and never introducing the word itself except in conjunction with Baptism.

2. They teach, in common with the writings of

⁹ I would refer the reader to the 4th, 5th, and 6th Chapters of Archbishop Laurence's Doctrine, &c. Part 1st—especially to the 5th Chapter, in which Cranmer's opinion is stated at length.—Of the Divines to whom I allude, I need only mention, Jewel, Hooker, Andrews, Taylor, and Barrow.

the ancient Christians, the necessity of faith and repentance as qualifications for the salutary effects of Baptism. But they never contemplate any person, however qualified, as regenerate, till he is actually baptized.

3. They suppose that infants, who are necessarily free from actual sin, are duly qualified for Baptism, and are looked on by God precisely in the same light as penitents and believers: and they unequivocally assert that every baptized infant without exception is born again.

4. They suppose that all baptized persons, whether infants or adults, contract a solemn engagement to holiness and newness of life: and that their continuance in a state of salvation depends on their future conduct.

5. They lay down a very plain and broad distinction between this grace of Regeneration, and conversion, repentance, renovation, and such Christian virtues and changes of the inward frame, as require the concurrence of man's will and endeavours, imply degrees, and are capable of increase.

CHAPTER VII.

A VIEW OF THE ATTEMPTS WHICH HAVE BEEN MADE
TO INVALIDATE THE LINE OF ARGUMENT PURSUED
IN THE LAST CHAPTER.

WE have seen in the preceding Chapter that the Church of England, treading in the steps of the primitive Christians, and of the universal Church, teaches with the greatest perspicuity the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, and confines the word to that single occurrence in her Articles and Liturgy. Some of her members, however, having adopted a notion, that Regeneration necessarily implies habitual holiness, that it is a turning point from evil to good, including an entire change of mind, a radical change of all the parts and faculties of the soul, or an implantation of such a habit of grace as must, in the very nature of things, produce a corresponding effect upon the life and manners, and, consequently,

that it can have no immediate dependence on Baptism, have endeavoured to set aside the line of argument that has been pursued, and to reconcile their own opinions to the clear and unambiguous statements of those formularies. It may seem a difficult business to make the language, which was meant to express one theory, correspond with another of a very different kind. Yet with the aid of a few subtle distinctions, arbitrary suppositions, and seeming analogies, ingenious men will easily satisfy themselves that they have accomplished this task, and will probably persuade others, whose views and opinions coincide with their own, that they have succeeded in their undertaking.

If our theories are sound, the difficulties which seem to embarrass them must be solved on such general principles, as are strictly applicable to the cases in question. If we are obliged to resort to experiments and temporary expedients, to analogies which have no real points of agreement, or to principles which do not bear upon the matters in debate, we have good reason to doubt the soundness of our opinions, and to suspect that the difficulties may possibly originate in the faultiness of our own theories.

Several solutions have been proposed in order to get rid of this discordance between the language of our own Church, and the opinions of some Churchmen. But in the mean time it seems to

have been forgotten, that the true sense of these compositions must be ascertained by investigating their genealogy, and endeavouring to discover the opinions of their compilers, and the principles on which they were really constructed.

Some of our Calvinistic Divines¹, who maintained the doctrines of an effectual call², the implantation

¹ *Etsi remissio peccati originalis in infantiâ morituro sit effectus prædestinationis, tamen non necesse est ut sit in omnibus infantibus baptizatis supravicturis effectus prædestinationis. Etsi enim parvulum non electum in eo statu ponat, ut sufficienter ordinet eum ad vitam æternam pro eo statu: tamen cum idem parvulus adoleverit, hæc sola remissio originalis reatûs non sufficit ut idem sufficienter ordinetur ad vitam pro statu adulti: nisi enim impleverit votum Baptismi, non justificatus erit pro modo adulti. Cum itaque multi baptizati infantes in adultâ ætate nunquam actu impleant votum Baptismi, ac proinde nunquam ad salutem pertingant: sequitur istius modi remissionem originalis peccati esse effectum communis providentiæ divinæ supernaturalis, et non effectum prædestinationis.* Dr. Samuel Ward.

This is quoted from a curious treatise, *de Infantilis Baptismi vi et efficacîâ*, inserted in the works of the learned Gataker. It contains a discussion between Dr. Ward, who was Margaret Professor, and Master of Sidney College, and one of King James's deputies to the Synod of Dort, and Gataker, upon the question, whether all infants are justified in Baptism? Large references are made in it to the writings of the most eminent Calvinistic Divines, from which I have borrowed several quotations.

To the quotations which I have borrowed from this tract, I have subjoined the letter G.

² By an effectual call is meant, in the language of these Divines, what Augustin styles a call according to God's purpose; that is, a call which necessarily implies perseverance to the end, and eternal salvation.

of a habit of grace, and the indefectibility of that habit, had too much learning and candour to suppose that the services of the Church had departed from the ancient doctrine, or that they were written in a strain of equivocation and subterfuge. They therefore allowed that the Church, in common with Augustin and the ancient Christians, explicitly teaches the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism; and readily granted that every baptized infant receives forgiveness of sin, and is born again of water and the Spirit. But they endeavoured to salve their own system by maintaining that the effectual call and saving special grace are the effects of God's firm predestination, whereas Regeneration in Baptism is only the effect of his supernatural Providence. What grounds there are for this distinction, is a question which may be safely left to the judgment of my readers.

A Calvinistic Prelate³ of some note has endeavoured to reconcile his own opinions to the language of the Church, by laying down a distinction between ecclesiastical and spiritual Regeneration. He contends that as there is an external and relative as well as an internal Sanctification, so there is an external as well as an internal Regeneration. But this analogy has no ground to rest upon. For Sanctification is a word of large compass, comprehending the outward separation of things and persons to

³ Bishop Hopkins.

God's service, and the removal of bodily and legal uncleannesses, as well as the inward purification of the soul. But Regeneration uniformly signifies a spiritual change, and Regeneration in Baptism is expressly called by our own Church "*spiritual* Regeneration," "a new birth of water and *the Spirit*," "a mystical *washing away of sin*," "a washing and sanctifying with *the Holy Ghost*."

These expedients however are so manifestly mere experiments, that they appear to have met with little approbation or encouragement. But the favourite method of solving this difficulty consists in an endeavour to show, that when our Church pronounces the baptized person regenerate, this declaration proceeds upon the ground of charitable supposition⁴, or generalized language; and we are

⁴ This judgment of charity is alleged by Bishop Carleton, in his Examination of Montague's Appeal, 195.

"Israel was called to be a people of God, but all that were so called, were not so in truth: so all that receive Baptism are called the children of God, regenerate, justified: for to us they must be taken for such in charity, until they show themselves other."

But Bishop Carleton argues professedly on the Calvinistic grounds, that none but the Elect (*i. e.* those who are infallibly predestinated to eternal life) are ever truly justified and regenerate, and that the regenerate can never fall from grace totally and finally.

He afterwards admits that the objections to the Calvinistic doctrine drawn from our Service Book, may be solved by the distinction between those who are regenerate *sacramento tenus*

taught that these principles pervade every part of our Liturgy. Here then is an attempt to get rid of this difficulty professedly upon general principles: but I apprehend that these principles, with whatever confidence they are relied upon, will fail in the application.

It is universally allowed, indeed it is plainly taught in our office for the Baptism of those of riper years, that the baptized adult is declared regenerate upon the supposition of his sincerity. But in the case of infants no such supposition can possibly be made; and consequently this principle of charitable supposition⁵ fails, upon the common grounds of analogical reasoning. But it is urged, that because sincerity is supposed in the case of adults, something like sincerity is supposed in the case of infants: or, what is more tangible ground, and appears to be the upshot of the argument, that the infant is pronounced regenerate, on the presumption that his vows and promises will be performed. Here again, if I mistake not, this principle of charitable supposition totally fails. We pronounce an adult regenerate not upon a presumption that his promises *only*, and those who are so according to God's purpose and calling. P. 107.

This is equivalent to the distinction maintained by Dr. Ward.

⁵ In fact the judgment which we pass upon adults can scarcely be called a charitable supposition. For after they have been instructed and examined, and their motives and principles scrutinized, *we* have no right to form any other judgment.

will be performed, but upon the supposition that his professions are sincere. His performing his promises and continuing God's servant are the objects of our hope, our prayers, and our exhortations: but we are too well acquainted with the weakness of our nature, and the condition of a life of trial, to act upon the presumption of such contingencies. Precisely in the same manner we pronounce the infant regenerate, not upon the supposition of an imaginary sincerity, but because we know that he cannot be insincere, and are convinced that there can be no other bar to his Regeneration: whilst, with respect to the performance of his vows and promises, we hope, we pray, we remind the sponsors of their duty, but we form no presumptions of his future conduct. The adult is bound to keep his engagements from the moment that he enters into them; the infant, when he is of an age to understand and perform them. But neither party is declared regenerate upon a presumption that he will acquit himself of his obligations.

The same plea, however, is brought forward in a somewhat different shape. It is contended that our Offices, when they pronounce baptized persons regenerate, merely make use of a generalized language⁶. This, we are told, is the principle on which

⁶ By *generalized*, or, as Mr. Faber now denominates it, *generic* language, he seems to mean such terms as may be affirmed of

all public documents proceed, and on which our Common Prayers are necessarily compiled. For instance, the Confessions of the Church are couched in general terms, without leading us to suppose, that every person who joins in them really feels the weight of his sins. The same generalized language pervades, we are taught, the whole body of the Epistles, in which all the Converts are addressed as *Saints, Elect, beloved of God, and sanctified in Jesus Christ*, though there can be no doubt that many of their number could have no just claim to these appellations. Upon the same principle, since it is not denied that some persons are regenerated in Baptism, and we cannot distinguish those who receive this blessing from those who are excluded from it, in this generalized language we declare every baptized individual regenerate.

Undoubtedly public documents addressed to, or framed for the use of, large bodies of men must employ language of this kind; and Common Prayers can be composed only on the supposition that they who join in them enter on the duty with sincerity and devotional feelings. Nor will it, I apprehend, be contended that all those who join in the prayers and confessions of our Church are truly devout and contrite; or that all the members of the Apostoli-

classes, or bodies, or communities, but cannot be affirmed of all the individuals of which they consist. Upon this term, generic, some remarks will be found in the Appendix.

cal Churches were such persons as their Christian profession implied and required. But I do not perceive what analogy there is between public documents and proclamations, the Common Prayers of a Church, or the Epistles of the Apostles to considerable bodies of converts, and an authoritative declaration pronounced by the minister upon particular individuals. We know that in the case of adults this declaration proceeds upon a persuasion of their sincerity; but since infants are not capable of insincerity, if we once allow the validity of their Baptism, it follows that the judgment which we pronounce upon them is absolute and unrestricted. For it can scarcely be doubted on any grounds of either reason or Scripture, that if one infant is qualified to receive Regeneration in Baptism, all infants are equally qualified.

It is contended, however, that since all men *are born in sin*, and *children of wrath*, and since infants are children of wrath up to the moment of their Baptism, we cannot pronounce them worthy recipients without a palpable contradiction. This objection appears to be built on a verbal fallacy. For by worthiness we do not mean any kind of desert, or positive congruity to receive grace, but such qualifications for Baptism and Regeneration as God is mercifully pleased to accept. But the same objection presses with equal force on the case of adult

Baptism. For the Scriptures, our own Church, and those members of it who allow that worthy adults are born again in Baptism, consider them likewise as children of wrath up to the moment of the Sacrament; and believe that faith and repentance are habits of mind, which God requires in the children of wrath, previously to their being made children of grace in Baptism. Infants, therefore, in this respect stand precisely on the same footing with worthy adults; and there is no more reason for supposing that God discriminates between different infants, than that He discriminates between adults, who are equally endowed with faith and repentance. Our Saviour at least seems to have allowed the worthiness of young children to partake of God's grace, when He blessed them, and affirmed that *of such is the kingdom of heaven*⁷. And our Church openly acknowledges it, when she exhorts us not to doubt of their being "favourably received⁸," in other words, "regenerated by God," on the very ground that our Saviour had "blessed them, and exhorted all men to follow their innocency." Those pious writers appear to have reasoned more justly, who have argued that, if God regenerates the greatest sinners when they repent of their sins, much more will He regenerate those infants who have no actual sins to repent

⁷ Mark x. 13.

⁸ Office for Public Baptism—Exhortation upon the Gospel.

of, and are only involved in the consequences of another's transgression⁹.

Attempts have been made to defend this mode of explaining the language of our baptismal offices from other passages of the Liturgy, in which the same principle is said to be acted upon. We have seen already that examples taken from the Common Prayers of the congregation are altogether inapplicable to the case before us. Indeed the only passages alleged, which bear any appearance of analogy to the language of these offices, are taken from the Catechism and the Burial Service.

In the Catechism the Child is taught to say, that he learns from the articles of his Creed to "believe in God the Holy Ghost, who sanctifieth him, and all the elect people of God." "If then," it is urged, "it is absurd to imagine that our Church deems every child who repeats his Catechism really one of God's elect people, and truly sanctified by the Holy

⁹ *Cæterum si homines impedire aliquid ad gratiæ consecutionem posset, magis adultos et proventus et majores natu possent impedire graviora peccata. Porro autem si etiam gravissimis delictoribus, et in Deum multum ante peccantibus, cum postea crediderint, remissa peccatorum datur, et a Baptismo atque a gratiâ nemo prohibetur: quantò magis prohiberi non debet infans, qui recens natus nihil peccavit, nisi quod secundum Adam carnaliter natus, contagium mortis antiquæ primâ nativitate contraxit? qui ad remissam peccatorum accipiendum, hoc ipso facilius accedit, quod illi remittuntur non propria sed aliena peccata? Cyprian, Ep. 65 ad Fidum, p. 161.*

Ghost, it is no less absurd to contend that it supposes every baptized infant to be actually regenerated. Consequently both these passages must be explained on the principle of general language." The truth is, that our Church considers every child who repeats this sentence as one of God's elect people, and sanctified by the Holy Ghost, upon the assured persuasion that he was regenerated, or made a child of God, and declared one of his elect people, in Baptism: and it reasonably supposes that a Christian of that age, who is enjoying the benefits of religious instruction, has done nothing hitherto to deprive him of that state of salvation to which he was then called, and that sanctification of the Spirit, of which he was then made partaker.

The passages quoted from the Burial Service seem to be strangely misapprehended. We yield thanks to God "that it hath pleased Him to take to Himself the soul of our departed brother, and to deliver him from the miseries of this sinful world:" and "we commit his body to the earth, in sure and certain hope of the resurrection to eternal life." We may, therefore, it is said, contend with as good reason, that in the opinion of our Church every brother committed to the earth has passed into a state of happiness, and will partake of the resurrection of life, as that it supposes every baptized infant to be actually regenerate. And these are produced as examples of generalized language, completely

parallel to the passages that have been quoted from our baptismal offices.

But the fact is, that the Church passes no judgment whatever upon the state of our departed brother. We declare our own full persuasion of the truth of the Christian doctrine of the resurrection to eternal life, and we thank God in the language of pious and grateful submission that He has taken to Himself the soul of our brother, and delivered him out of the miseries of this sinful world: but the only allusion which we make to his present condition is a charitable hope that he rests in Christ¹. But it will scarcely be contended that there is any analogy between a charitable hope, and an unequivocal and authoritative declaration, or a thanksgiving for mercies actually received.

If, indeed, the compilers of our Liturgy had thought that only some infants are born again in Baptism, they were men of too much honesty and simplicity of character to employ what cannot be called ambiguous, but delusive and dangerous language. They were not tied down to technical forms, or what has been called *baptismal phraseology*,

¹ "We meekly beseech thee, O Father, to raise us from the death of sin to the life of righteousness, that when we depart hence, we may rest in him, as our *hope* is this our brother doth." Burial Service.

If there is any ambiguity in the other expressions quoted from this Service, it appears to be sufficiently cleared up and removed by this passage.

but were at full liberty to frame these offices upon their own principles, and to couch them in such language as was best calculated to express their real sentiments. This they have done with perfect simplicity and good faith, and have set forth their own belief, and the belief of their forefathers in Christianity, without verbal ambiguity or mental reserve.

It is contended likewise that the Prayers of our Church for the circumcision of the spirit, and for the creation of a new heart, are in point of fact Prayers for Regeneration; and, consequently, that it is as reasonable to maintain that the Church considers all Christians unregenerate, as that she considers all baptized persons regenerate. But it has been sufficiently shown that in Scripture and in the doctrinal language of the Church, Regeneration and the circumcision of the heart are spoken of as graces entirely distinct in theory. The word Regeneration, in the popular sense which it has acquired, is indeed equivalent to those phrases; but the word is never used in our Liturgy otherwise than in its strict theological acceptation.

Much stress has been laid upon a passage of the Homilies, in which the words Regenerate² and Re-

² Homily for Whitsunday, 430.—See Archbishop Laurence's Doctrine, &c. part i. c. vi. p. 75, &c.

The Archbishop of Cashel observes, that in this passage "the word *regeneration* is used loosely and largely as blended with its

generation are introduced without any immediate reference to Baptism. But in this passage, ex-

usual effects, the object of the writer being to treat of *regeneration and sanctification united*—comprehending not only the commencement, but also the completion of sanctification, and even the miraculous operation of the Holy Spirit upon the minds of the Prophets and Apostles.”

The Homilies of the Church, with the exception of the Homily of Salvation, which is composed in a more scholastic form, and was intended to give a correct statement of a controverted doctrine, are popular discourses, written for the edification of the people in a rhetorical way, and therefore must be read with those allowances which are due to popular compositions.

Bishop Montague, in his Appeal to Cæsar, has some just and sensible remarks on these writings of our Church.

“ First, I willingly admit the Homilies as containing certain godly and wholesome exhortations to move the people to honour and worship Almighty God; but not as the *public dogmatical resolutions* of the Church of England. The 35th Article giveth them to contain godly and wholesome doctrine, and necessary for these times: which they may do though they have not dogmatical positions, or doctrine to be propugned and subscribed in all and every point; as the Books of Articles and Common Prayer have. They seem, secondly, to speak somewhat too hardly, and to stretch some sayings beyond the use and practice of the Church of England; and yet what they say may receive a fair construction and mitigation. In very Scripture there are many hyperbolical sayings, that, being literally taken, will not hold weight in the balance of the Sanctuary. In the writings of the Fathers there are dogmatical conclusions for resolution in points, and rhetorical enforcements to edify affections, disposed for and according to the auditory. Now our Homilies are popular sermons, fitted to the capacities of the common people, to edify them, to work upon them, ever strong in passion, but weak in understanding. We may do well to consider them, why,

tracted from a popular discourse, the word is used in a popular and rhetorical manner, including the miraculous and extraordinary operations of the Holy Ghost upon the human soul. Nothing however will be gained in the way of legitimate inference, by arguing from the popular to the strict signification of words, and attempting to neutralize their plain and unambiguous meaning through the medium of their figurative usages.

wherefore, when, and to what manner of men these popular sermons were made and did speak ; and *not press every passage hand over head, for advantage*. I rest in that judgment which our Church has passed upon them, where it is said, in terminis — *They contain a godly and a wholesome doctrine, necessary for these times*, the times in which and for which they were especially made." Appeal, p. 260.

It has been contended that our Church does not maintain that all infants are regenerated in Baptism, because in the same Homily all its members are directed to examine themselves whether they are regenerate or not. But this is not the fact. For though the word Regenerate is used loosely in this Homily, the distinction between the new birth and the abiding influence of the Spirit is nevertheless laid down, and men are not taught to inquire whether they have been born again, but whether the Holy Ghost is dwelling in them.

"Such is the power of the Holy Ghost to regenerate men, and as it were to bring them forth anew, so that they shall be nothing like the men that they were before.

"Neither doth he think it sufficiently inwardly to work the spiritual and new birth of man, *unless he do also dwell and abide in him*." Then, after proving this point from Scripture, it adds, "O but how shall I know *that the Holy Ghost is in me*? some man perchance will say: Forsooth as the tree is known by its fruits, so is the Holy Ghost."

Having now shown that the attempts which have been made to accommodate the Services of our Church to a theory which dissolves the connexion between Regeneration and Baptism will not bear the test of examination, but are merely expedients to get rid of a difficulty which presses upon the advocates of another system, I will, before I close this Chapter, add a few considerations, which may be useful to my younger brethren in the Ministry, and to those who are Candidates for the Sacred Function.

The Services of our Church, connected with this question, are formed on the principles and expressed in the language of the ancient Christians, and assert in the most unequivocal manner their doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism. That every baptized person, with the exception of unworthy adults, is born again of water and of the Spirit in this Sacrament, and receives forgiveness of sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost, is an opinion which they affirm in a way level to every capacity. If therefore the Ministers of our Church should propagate from the pulpit opinions widely different from those which they teach, when they are ministering the Sacrament of Baptism, let them consider what confusion they will produce in the minds of their hearers; what distrust in themselves, and in the Church whose Ministers they are. But, what is perhaps still worse, the desire to reconcile these services to opi-

nions at variance with them, will tend to impair the sincerity and simplicity of their own minds, by giving them a taste for that unnatural and artificial mode of interpretation, to which an attachment to preconceived opinions too frequently gives entertainment. We are told that these services make use of a general phraseology, or of hypothetical language, and expressions of hope and charity. But plain sense, sober criticism, and historical research, refute these artificial attempts to affix to them a meaning, very different from that which they bear at first sight, and foreign from the views and principles on which they were originally constructed. Our Liturgy speaks a plain, simple, and ingenuous language, "adapted to popular comprehension and instruction ³:" and the attempts, to which system has had recourse, to wrest it from its genuine and native meaning, may act as beacons and warnings to the inexperienced, and teach them that it is a dangerous experiment to tamper with its literal construction. "There is nothing," says Hooker, "more dangerous than this licentious and deluding art, which changeth the meaning of words as alchymy doth or would do the substance of metals, maketh of any thing what it listeth, and bringeth in the end all truth to nothing."

³ Archbishop Laurence.

CHAPTER VIII.

THE THEORY OF REGENERATION IN BAPTISM CONSIDERED.

IN inquiring into the doctrinal views of our Church on the subject of Regeneration in Baptism, we have seen to what conclusions we are led by the direct and unsophisticated meaning of its Public Offices, and what kind of machinery has been employed in order to invalidate these conclusions. On the one side, the construction of the Offices, and the sense which results from them, are obvious to the plainest understanding. On the other, they are subjected to the ordeal of a forced and unnatural interpretation, principles are resorted to which are inapplicable to the cases before us, and analogies are insisted on, which have scarcely the shadow of any proportion or point of agreement. We have seen likewise that the doctrine which our services contain, according to the most obvious and legitimate principles of inter-

pretation, is precisely what we might have expected from the views and professions of their compilers. For it is in complete accordance with the opinions of Catholic Christianity, from the days of the Apostles to the time of the Reformation. It came before them, not as a doubtful and disputed point, but as a fundamental and established truth; not asserted and defended by a few Doctors and Apologists as their own private opinion, but recorded or alluded to, as a doctrine received without contradiction in the Church of Christ, by the whole body of Fathers, Councils, and Ecclesiastical Historians. And we have seen on what strong and pregnant testimonies of Scripture this doctrine depends, and how little support its opponents derive from those texts which they have brought forward to controvert it.

Here then the question might well rest. For when the debate relative to the sense of our Offices has been brought to such an issue as appears to amount to a moral demonstration, and the Scriptural view of the doctrine has been investigated and ascertained, it may seem superfluous to inquire farther into the theory of this doctrine, or any other views and theories of Regeneration. Since however this opinion has been often charged with unreasonableness, and loaded with a strange variety of absurd and formidable consequences, I shall enter a little more particularly into its theory; explaining the

nature of the change implied by the word Regeneration, and endeavouring to point out some probable grounds and reasons of our Saviour's institution, and of the close connexion which He has established by his word and promise between Baptism and spiritual Regeneration.

*That every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights*¹, is a truth not less agreeable to reason, than plainly inculcated in Scripture. But the spiritual gifts and blessings, which we refer back to God as their author and giver, are of two kinds, distinct in theory, and separated by a broad line of demarcation. Some are pure acts of God's special grace and bounty, which, though they usually require certain qualifications on man's part to prepare him for the reception of them, exclude at once every notion of human co-operation. To these acts of grace we can assign no parts nor latitude, for they appear, at least to our judgment, to take place at some determinate point of time, and to be incapable of increase. Such appears to be the nature not only of the forgiveness of our sins, but of that justification in the sight of God which accompanies it. Faith, repentance, the renunciation of our sins, resolutions of obedience, and the forgiveness of other men's trespasses, are qualifications which we must possess to prepare and

¹ James i. 17.

fit us for these blessings. The necessity of faith is moreover pressed upon us, not only as a qualification for pardon and acceptance, but as that act of mind which closes with God's offers and terms of grace, pleads in our behalf his merciful promises, and the atonement and merits of our blessed Saviour, and renounces all other grounds of confidence and dependence. But forgiveness itself and justification in God's sight are pure acts of grace: for, as the Jews justly argued, *none can forgive sins but God only*², and none but God can place a reprieved sinner on the same footing with a righteous man. Arguing likewise from the analogy of human proceedings, we have reason to think that pardon, and the imputation of righteousness which is annexed to it, are grants of mercy bestowed upon the sinner at some particular point of time, and that though the justified person must *grow in grace*, must advance more and more in God's favour and those spiritual accomplishments which correspond to it, forgiveness itself is a simple act, without parts or latitude, and in course incapable of increase.

But there are other gifts or blessings of a spiritual kind, emanating from God, and referred upward to Him as their principal cause, which imply in their very nature increase and progressive advances, proceeding onward from potential principles and dispo-

² Mark ii. 7. Luke v. 21.

sitions to active principles and habits, and requiring in all their stages the co-operation of man with the grace and inspiration of God. They are, therefore, spoken of in Scripture sometimes as the gifts of God, sometimes as the duties of man; and this way of treating them plainly signifies that, as our endeavours to attain and perfect these Christian virtues will be ineffectual without the grace of God, so in the ordinary course of his dispensations, he will not continue his gifts to us, unless we endeavour to make a right use of them by exercising them in their proper spheres and functions. Hence, in the language of promise and encouragement, and of devotion and gratitude, these Christian habits or virtues are spoken of as exclusively the gifts of God: in the language of exhortation and religious instruction, and in the systematic exposition of Christian doctrine, they are spoken of as duties which God, if man is not wanting to himself, will enable him to fulfil. Of this sort are faith, hope, and charity, mortification and self-denial, the circumcision of the heart, and the renewal of the spirit of the mind—in short, all those virtues or graces, which have their seat in the intellectual and moral nature of man, admit of degrees, and are capable of improvement. For these are (to use the language of Waterland) “the joint work of the Spirit and the man:” and therefore in Scripture they are sometimes promised us as gifts, or spoken of as

the issues of God's bounty; at other times they are expressly required of us as duties, which we owe to God and our own souls.

Such being the broad line of distinction between those blessings, which are pure and unmixed acts of God's special grace, and those Christian habits or virtues in whose formation and increase man must bear his part, it is scarcely necessary to say that, according to the principles of our own Church and of the ancient Christians, Regeneration is a pure act of God's special grace, immanent in Himself and terminating in man, limited and determined to a particular time, and incapable of latitude. For according to these principles Regeneration consists in the forgiveness of sin, ³ the gift, or earnest, or covenanted consignation of the influence of the Holy Ghost, considered as a potential principle of

³ Plane eadem gratia spiritalis, quæ æqualiter in Baptismo a credentibus sumitur, in conversatione atque actu nostro post modum vel minuitur vel augetur. Cyprian, Epist. ad Magnum, 69. P. 187.

Again, in the same Epistle, in which he is defending the baptism of those who were called Clinici, that is, who were baptized in their beds, when their lives were in danger, he says—An consecuti sunt quidem gratiam dominicam, sed brevior et minor mensurâ muneris divini ac Spiritûs Sancti? Quin imò Spiritus Sanctus non de mensurâ datur, sed super credentem totus effunditur. Nan si dies omnibus æqualiter nascitur, et si Sol super omnes pari et æquali luce diffunditur, quantò magis Christus, Sol et dies verus, in Ecclesiâ suâ lumen vitæ æternæ pari æqualitate largitur!

new life, independently of its moral operations, and legitimate effects; and a title to eternal life depending on the performance of certain stipulated conditions. Now, though no adult can partake of these blessings without being previously qualified by faith and repentance, it is certain that they are mere acts of free grace and mercy, which must, as far as we can judge, be made over to the soul at some determinate moment, and are not the effects of any *immediate* exercise of the moral nature of man, and of that principle of self-action which God has implanted in us. But our own Church, in conformity to the doctrine of Scripture, and the opinion of Christian antiquity⁴, determines this grant of grace to the season of our Baptism, under a full conviction that when this Sacrament is administered

⁴ Neque enim parva res hæreticis et modica conceditur, quando a nobis baptismus eorum in acceptum refertur : cum inde incipiat omnis fidei origo, et purificandis et sanctificandis Dei servis divina dignatio. Nam si baptizari quis apud hæreticos potuit, utique et remissam peccatorum consequi potuit. Si peccatorum remissam consecutus est, et sanctificatus est et templum Dei factus. Cyp. Ep. 73. ad Jubaianum.

Et quoniam Stephanus et qui illi consentiunt contendunt dimissionem peccatorum, et secundam nativitatem in hæreticorum baptismo procedere posse, apud quos ipsi confitentur Spiritum Sanctum non esse, considerent et intelligant spiritalem nativitatem sine Spiritu Sancto esse non posse. Firmilianus, Cypriano, Ep. 75.

Stephanus concedit illis non modicam sed maximam gratiæ potestatem, ut dicat eos per baptismi sacramentum sordes veteris hominis ablueri, antiquæ mortis peccata donare, regeneratione

agreeably to Christ's institution, man receives the forgiveness of sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost through its intervention and instrumentality. Theologians, indeed, both ancient and modern, sometimes describe this change in strong language, and make use of expressions which must be taken in a qualified sense. But when divested of rhetorical amplification, they will be found to convey the same notions and to exhibit the same view of the doctrine of baptismal Regeneration, as are the result of sober inquiry and dispassionate discussion.

This view of the nature of Regeneration cannot

cœlesti filios Dei facere, ad æternam vitam divini lavacri sanctificatione reparare. Id.

Si baptismum hæreticorum habere potest lavacrum secundæ nativitatis, non hæretici sed filii Dei computandi sunt, qui apud eos baptizantur. Secunda enim nativitas, quæ est in baptismo, filios Deo generat. Id.

The argument of Cyprian and his adherents against the validity of heretical baptism, proceeds upon the assumption that Christians are born again, and receive forgiveness of sin and the Holy Ghost in Baptism. Augustin's opinion on this question has been already alluded to.

Augustin referring to 1 Cor. iii. 1. 16, says,

Vide quæ dicat mala de ignorantie malo venientia. Et puto quod non de Catechumenis ista dicebat. *Parvuli* quippe *in Christo* quo modo essent, nisi jam *renati essent*? Quod si nondum credas, quid eis post pauca dicat attende. *Nescitis quia templum Dei estis, et Spiritus Sanctus habitat in vobis*? An adhuc dubitabis vel negabis, non eos potuisse esse templum Dei, in quo habitaret Spiritus Dei, nisi baptizatos?

be better expressed than in the words of Hooker. "Baptism is a Sacrament which God hath instituted in his Church, to the end that they which receive the same might thereby be incorporated into Christ; and so through his most precious merits obtain as well that saving grace of imputation, which taketh away all former guiltiness, as also that infused divine virtue of the Holy Ghost, which giveth to the powers of the soul their first disposition towards future newness of life⁵." Later systems indeed

⁵ Hooker's Eccles. Polity, B. v. § 60.

This passage has been sometimes quoted to prove the very reverse of what Hooker teaches: viz. that Regeneration precedes Baptism in qualified adults. Hooker, however, without excluding the preparatory action of the Holy Ghost on the soul, affirms, in common with all the ancient Christians, that his divine virtue is first infused into, or consigned over to, the human soul in Baptism. Nor does he mean by *future newness of life* the whole change of the inward frame, which must commence in adults previous to Baptism, but that newness of life, or covenanted state of holiness, which commences with the forgiveness of sin. For the new life of Christians is always supposed to date from their New Birth, that is, from their Baptism. Archbishop Laurence's observation, that the word *disposition* is a Latinism, and signifies the arrangement, or setting in order of the parts of the soul, may be illustrated by a quotation from Thomas Aquinas, which occurs in the Apology for the Augsburg Confession.

Peccatum originis habet privationem originalis justitiæ, et cum hoc *inordinatam dispositionem partium animæ*, unde non est privatio pura, sed quidam habitus corruptus. Melancthonis Opera, vol. i. folio, p. 61,

Hooker seems to be expressing himself in the same figurative way as Aquinas. He contemplates the divine virtue of the Holy

have obtruded upon us very different notions of Regeneration, excluding from its definition, what the ancients principally insisted on, the forgiveness of sin, and substituting for this earnest of the Spirit or infusion of the divine virtue of the Holy Ghost, the scholastic fancy of an implantation of habits or of a turning point from evil to good, attended with such a radical change of all the parts and faculties of the soul as must necessarily terminate in holiness of life and conversation. But these speculations are inconsistent with Scriptural truth and simplicity, the experience of human nature, and the frame and constitution of the human soul.

Three things are to be considered in Baptism—The qualifications which it requires, the act of grace which it conveys, and the engagements and obligations which it imposes. In adults faith and repentance are required as qualifications, and these spiritual acts necessarily suppose the preventing and co-operating grace of God. It is however the decided doctrine of the Church that the convert is regenerated in Baptism, and then, and not till then, receives remission of his sins, and the covenanted grant or infused virtue of the Holy Ghost: and

Ghost, infused into the soul in Baptism, as beginning from that time to arrange and restore to order those parts of it which had been thrown into disorder and confusion by the fall. Perhaps, however, his phraseology may be grounded on the common ethical distinction between *dispositions* and *habits*.

that infants, who can possess no positive qualifications, partake in their measure and proportion of the same blessings; receive remission of their sins by spiritual Regeneration, and are washed and sanctified with the Holy Ghost⁶. But though infants are endowed with this infused virtue and mysterious earnest of the Holy Spirit, his active influences and operations appear to be commensurate with our natural faculties. In enlightening the understanding and forming the moral habits, he follows the order of intellectual and moral causes, proportioning his effects to the expanding and elastic qualities, and the corresponding exertions and activity of the human mind⁷. In the case of

⁶ *Dicimus ergo in baptizatis parvulis, quamvis id nesciunt, habitare Spiritum Sanctum; sic enim eum nesciunt, quamvis sit in eis, quemadmodum et nesciunt mentem suam, cujus in eis ratio, quâ uti nondum possunt, velut quædam scintilla sopita est, excitanda ætatis accessu. Augustin, Ep. 57.*

Hæc gratia baptizatos etiam parvulos corpori suo inserit—dat etiam sui Spiritûs occultissimam fidelibus gratiam, quam latenter infundit et parvulis. De Peccat. Mer. et Remiss. c. 9.

⁷ Having quoted a passage from Augustin—*Oportet igitur ut Sacramento regenerationis, ne sine illo male de hâc vitâ exeat, etiam parvulus imbuatur: quod non fit nisi in remissione peccatorum. Dr. Ward adds,*

Ex hoc loco constat juxta Augustinum primitias renovationis habere parvulos a remissione peccatorum in Baptismo; ipsam vero renovationem, quæ gradatim perficitur, et sanctificationem non habere. Certe videtur statuere adæquatum Baptismi effectum in parvulis esse illam renovationem quæ fit solâ remissione peccatorum: alteram autem renovationem, quæ fit ad

infants, therefore, the Spirit of grace, which is designed to be a principle of spiritual life, is a potential principle: or, to speak perhaps more properly, the Holy Ghost does not, as it would seem, begin to act upon the soul by calling into play its latent good dispositions, till there are materials on which to act; and, so far as we can judge by experience, till those means of grace are resorted to on man's part, to which his abiding and practical influences are promised and tied down. Hence, when religious instruction and moral discipline are neglected, Regeneration in Baptism is productive of no practical effects. The infused virtue of the Holy Ghost is, to speak in the mildest terms, dormant, and inactive: the soul continues in its natural state of darkness and ignorance, and that infection of nature, which remains in the regenerate, experiences no check from the supernatural and remedial principle. At other times, as children advance onward in life, evil dispositions and unruly passions, or the influence of worldly customs and bad examples, counteract the effects of discipline and instruction,

imaginem Dei, non incipere nisi eo tempore quo fit conversio cordis.

But we have seen in the last note, that Augustin holds that the Holy Ghost is bestowed on infants in Baptism, though his practical effects upon the heart and habits do not, and cannot, as it would seem, in the nature of things, commence till afterwards.

and that power of the Spirit which attends upon them.

If indeed it were a self-evident truth that Regeneration is an implantation of a habit of grace⁸, containing in it the habits of all Christian graces or virtues, and necessarily terminating in them, or that it is a radical change of all the parts and faculties of the soul, it might be absurd to suppose that those infants who, as they grow up, exhibit no signs of spiritual habits or dispositions, have been regenerated in Baptism. But that sound and masculine theology which our Church has adopted, knows nothing of these speculations. It is to be regretted indeed that those writers who have descanted on the unreasonableness of our doctrine, have not been at the pains to inquire what those opinions are, which they have taxed with so many absurdities and contradictions: and that they have never been tempted to look a little more narrowly into the reasonableness of their own theory.

We find indeed in the writings of the Fathers glowing and animated descriptions of the effects of Baptism on adult converts⁹. But they contain

⁸ The implantation of a habit of grace may perhaps mean the same thing as the infused virtue of the Holy Ghost, or a potential principle if not considered as *necessarily* terminating in active habits of holiness.

⁹ Ego cum in tenebris atque in nocte cæcâ jacerem, cumque in salo jactantis seculi nutabundus ac dubius, vestigiis oberrantibus

nothing inconsistent with the simple Scriptural truth, nor with the moral nature and rational faculties of man. For it is reasonable to suppose that when the Spirit is consigned over to sincere converts, He will exert an influence on their inward frame proportioned to their faith and charity, and the sincerity and zeal of their Christian purposes.

flutuarem ; vitæ meæ nescius, veritatis ac lucis alienus ; difficile prorsus ac durum pro illis tunc moribus opinabar, quod in salutem mihi divina indulgentia pollicebatur, ut quis renasci denuo possit ; utque in novam vitam lavacro aquæ salutaris animatus, quod prius fuerat, exponeret ; et corporis licet manente compage hominem animo ac mente mutaret. Qui possibilis, aiebam, est tanta conversio, ut repente ac perniciter exuatur quod genuinum situ materiæ naturalis obduruisset, vel usurpatum diu senio vetustatis inolevit ?—Sed postquam undæ genitalis auxilio superioris ævi labe detersâ, in expiatum pectus ac purum desuper se lumen infudit ; postquam cœlitus Spiritu hausto, in novum me hominem nativitas secunda reparavit ; mirum in modum protinus confirmare se dubia, patere clausa, lucere tenebrosa ; facultatem dare quod prius difficile videbatur ; geri posse quod prius impossibile putabatur ut esset : agnoscere terrenum fuisse quod prius carnaliter natum delictis obnoxium viveret ; Dei esse cœpisse, quod jam Spiritus Sanctus animaret. Scis ipse profecto et mecum pariter recognoscis, quid detraxerit nobis, quidve contulerit mors ista criminum, vita virtutum. Cyprian ad Donatum, p. 2, 3.

Cyprian is not speaking of these sensible changes in his intellectual and moral nature as constituting his new birth, but as its effects or consequences following the operation of the regenerating water, and his second nativity. He describes the renovating process that ensued after the light had been poured into his soul through the aid of the regenerating water, and the second birth had formed him into a new man.

And we may easily persuade ourselves that the convert himself, who returns from the laver under a full conviction that his sins are washed away, that he has been sealed with the Spirit as God's child and peculiar property, and that the Holy Ghost has been bestowed upon him for a helpmate and sojourner, will feel as it were a load removed from him, and a spring and elasticity communicated to his whole soul; and that he will enter on the discharge of his Christian duties with tenfold vigour and activity. But these descriptions, when stripped of rhetorical colouring, do not convey the notion of the instantaneous transformation of the moral nature, an infusion of habits, or a radical change of the parts and faculties of the soul. The maxim of these Christians was—*according to thy faith be it done unto thee*¹—and they believed, with equal wisdom and

¹ Nostrum tantum sitiat pectus ac pateat: quantum illic fidei capacis afferimus, tantum gratiæ inundantis haurimus. Cyprian ad Donatum, p. 4.

Cæterum si tu innocentiae, si justitiæ viam teneas, si illapsâ firmitate vestigiî tui incedas, si in Deum viribus totis, ac toto corde suspensus, hoc sis tantum quod esse cœpisti: tantum tibi ad licentiam datur, quantum gratiæ spiritalis augetur. Ibid. p. 3.—i. e. tantum potes, quantum credis. Fell.—The word *licentia* here means *freedom* or power of action.

Quales nos fecit secundâ nativitate, tales vult renatos perseverare. Cyprian de Or. Dom. p. 149.

Hoc etiam secundum fidem Catholicam credimus, quod acceptâ per Baptismum gratiâ, omnes baptizati, Christo co-operante et adjuvante, quæ ad salutem pertineant possint ac

piety, that the moral effects of the Holy Ghost upon the soul, both in and after Baptism, are proportioned to the faith and religious exertions of the convert himself.

As to the engagements which are contracted in Baptism, they are equally binding on all recipients, whether baptized in infancy or riper years, for they are the conditions on which our continuance in that state of salvation, to which we have been called, absolutely depends. But no one is pronounced regenerate on the presumption that those engagements will be performed. It has, indeed, been confidently affirmed, in opposition to the tenets of our Church and Scripture, that true grace is indefectible; that no man, therefore, is regenerated in Baptism who does not keep his baptismal contract; and, consequently, that habitual holiness is the only test of spiritual Regeneration. We, however, do not imagine, that God regenerates our infants on principles of favoritism and caprice, because Baptism is too frequently unproductive of practical and saving effects: but we ascribe this failing to human negli-

debeant, si fideliter laborare voluerint, adimplere. Conc. Auriacum. Expressing the general sense of the Christian Churches.

Sit tantum timor innocentiae custos, ut qui in mentes nostras indulgentiae coelestis allapsu clementer Dominus infulsit, in animi oblectantis hospitio justâ operatione teneatur: ne accepta securitas indiligentiam pariat, et vetus denuò hostis obrepât. Cypr. ad Don. p. 3.

gence and default. Though the stipulations of the sponsors, as proxies for children, are rather a pious and salutary custom of the Church, than a necessary part of Baptism, every baptized person virtually contracts the engagements which those stipulations contain; and parents and guardians of infants are bound, without any formal professions, to second and promote the good work which God has begun in them, by religious instruction and moral discipline. For the child of God is necessarily trusted in his early years to the care and institution of human parents, and it depends much on their vigilance and faithfulness to their trust, whether that Spirit which has been consigned over to him in Baptism shall remain dormant, or be brought forth into play and activity; whether he shall be spiritually born only, or shall grow up in habits of spirituality and holiness.

There are, however, persons who think that this necessary connexion between Baptism and Regeneration, which results from the obvious construction of Scripture and our baptismal Offices, is untenable upon principles of reason. In their opinion, common sense forbids us to suppose that Baptism, which is the work of man upon the body, is ordinarily accompanied with Regeneration, which is the work of God upon the soul; or that the sprinkling of the human body with water can be followed by a change of this magnitude and importance. But surely it

becomes us rather to accept God's boons and bounties, in the way which He has prescribed, with humility and thankfulness, than to bring his ordinances and revelations to the standard of our own reason. If a doctrine has no foundation in Scripture, or is only built on a *few obscure* passages, whilst it is contradicted by *the whole tenour and current* of Holy Writ, these are good grounds for its rejection; and we shall generally find that the support which it seems to derive from Scripture, may be removed by the aid of received and general principles of interpretation. But where a doctrine is in no sense *contradictory* to reason and experience, where it harmonizes with the whole system of revealed religion, and where the language in which it is contained is plain and intelligible, it has every claim to our assent, and ought not lightly to be called in question. For my own part, I am at a loss to discover, why this doctrine is more unreasonable than the doctrines of original sin, the incarnation of the Son of God, atonement by his blood, or the resurrection of the body; and why it is not to be received with the same assurance of faith, and the same freedom from sceptical doubts and ambitious curiosity.

Yet it often happens, that where we are unable to penetrate into the nature of the truths revealed to us, or to trace out the connexion between causes and effects, we can discover some probable presumptions and grounds of reason, which so far as

our benefit is intended, and our interest concerned, furnish us with a clue to their propriety and suitability. Some presumptions and probabilities of this kind may be assigned for this institution of our Saviour, and for the close union which He has established by his word and promise between outward Baptism and spiritual Regeneration.

In the first place, this institution is founded upon known principles, and appears to be a benevolent accommodation to the weakness of human nature, and the customs of common life. In all ages and countries, the transfer of property and the conveyance of grants, privileges, and offices have commonly been attended with some outward signs or symbolical actions. Personal freedom, the freedom of cities, magistracies, and even royalty itself, have been conferred in this manner. The sealing or stamping of public or private property, legal instruments, investitures, and inaugurations, are forms and ceremonies familiar to the minds of mankind. The same customs had been introduced into the religions of the world. External symbols were tokens of initiation into the mysteries of the pagan deities; and were used by the Jews in the reception of their proselytes: and God had sanctioned them, by admitting the Israelites to the privileges and promises of the old covenant through the medium of circumcision. When, therefore, our Saviour adopted the same mode of initiation and investiture, conveying to his

disciples the forgiveness of their sins, and the privileges, blessings, and promises of the covenant of grace through means of an outward sign which was already familiar to their minds, and the import of which they well understood, this institution fell in with the views and customs of those persons for whose use it was intended, and was a merciful condescension to the feelings and habits of mankind.

In the next place, we must observe, that the leading parts and peculiar doctrines of Christianity are addressed almost exclusively to our faith. Christ's hearers were required to believe, upon the strength of those evidences that were before them, and in direct opposition to their popular prejudices and prepossessions, that he was the Messiah, or *he that should come into the world*. In the same manner, the doctrines which relate to his person and the purposes of his mission, his Godhead and incarnation, redemption, atonement, sanctification by his Spirit, the resurrection of the body, and the circumstances of the last judgment, are proposed to our faith; and the benefit which we are to derive from them depends in a great measure upon the steadfastness of our belief in their certainty. What is the exact nature of the union between God and man in our Saviour's person; *how* the death of Christ atones for our sins, and purges our consciences from dead works; by what process the Holy Ghost acts upon the human soul; are questions with which we have

no concern. If the truths themselves are plainly revealed in Scripture, and the contents of Scripture are the word of God, we must receive them with the same assurance as if we could analyze and expound them with the most minute accuracy, and penetrate into the secret parts of the divine economy. But the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism stands precisely on the same footing with these weighty truths, and harmonizes with the whole scheme of revealed religion. It is proposed to our belief, and is intended to be a test and exercise of it: it demands of us the same kind of assent, which we owe to the other peculiar doctrines of Christianity; and it is our business to believe it in the simplicity with which it is taught us, without attempting to unravel God's mysterious operations on the soul, and without being offended at the meanness of the instruments, through which pardon and grace are made over to us.

But farther. Our Regeneration in Baptism, implying this close connexion between the grace bestowed and the sign which denotes it, is an act of tenderness and mercy, not less worthy of God's infinite benevolence, than analogous to the whole course of his dealings with man. Goodness, indeed, seems to be the leading feature of his government, and the key to his mysterious dispensations: and those theological systems which straiten his goodness, and depend principally on abstract views of

his sovereignty and glory, will be found on investigation to have no foundation in his word, nor in the history and experience of mankind. But if man, considered as an alien from God and a child of wrath, had been left to collect the assurance of adoption into his family and restoration to his favour, in the best way that he was able, without any specific form or positive consignation of these privileges and blessings, he would have been placed, as it were, without chart or compass, in a troubled sea of doubt, suspense, and anxiety, and would have been tempted to resort to fanciful and fanatical criterions of sonship and reconciliation. But on the principles which our Church deduces from Scripture, he receives in the sacrament of Baptism such comfortable assurances of God's favour and loving-kindness, as are sufficient, if duly prized and religiously pondered, to bring peace to his mind, and to invigorate his soul to duty. For, on these principles, the convert to the faith of Christ, who receives Baptism rightly, may assure himself, that as certainly as God is true, and his *promises in Christ are yea and amen*¹, so surely he is released from the bond and penalty of his sins, endowed with the earnest of the Holy Ghost, as a principle of new life and holy endeavour, and enrolled among the children of God, and the inheritors of the kingdom

¹ 2 Cor. i. 20.

of heaven. On the same principles, the parent will “not doubt but earnestly believe” that his child, who was “born in sin and in the wrath of God, is by the laver of Regeneration in Baptism, received into the number of his children, and heirs of everlasting life.” Here we rest on sure ground. And the very fact that our Regeneration in Baptism, as stated and believed by the Church, is a strong evidence of God’s goodness and condescension to fallen man, amounts to a presumption of its truth, since, whilst it cannot be charged with unreasonableness, it shows that it is suitable to our wants, and analogous to the general course of the Divine economy.

Since then this theory of Regeneration, independently of the paramount authority of Scripture, is raised on a foundation of sound sense and sober argument, and is free from every suspicion of unreasonableness and absurdity; and since, without attempting to fathom the depths of this mystery of godliness, we can discover some probable grounds and reasons of the connexion which our Saviour has established between Baptism and Regeneration, we shall not act wisely if we renounce the faith of our forefathers in Christianity, upon “the mere show of a conceit;” and exchange it for any of those novel and discordant theories, which the ingenuity of modern theologians has substituted for it. Having learned that *he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*, that *Baptism doth save us*, that we are saved

by the washing of Regeneration, and that except a man be born again of water and of the Spirit he cannot enter into the kingdom of God, we shall do well to be contented with the plain and literal interpretation, which our own Church and the ancient Christians have put upon these texts, and the simple and obvious conclusions which they have drawn from them. Some minds may be captivated with the theories to which they have attached themselves, and others may find a pleasure in solving problems and difficulties of their own creation. But the plain straightforward path of Scriptural truth, whilst it presents us with no such objects as can fascinate the imagination, or pamper the vanity of the understanding, is beset with no toils, and presents few perplexing difficulties to a believing and humble mind.

Study to show thyself approved unto God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed, rightly dividing (i. e. keeping the straight path and beaten road of) *the word of truth* ³.

³ 2 Tim. ii. 15.

CHAPTER IX.

AN ACCOUNT OF THE PRINCIPAL CHANGES WHICH
HAVE TAKEN PLACE IN THE DOCTRINE OF REGE-
NERATION AND IN THE USE OF THE WORD.

SUCH is the weakness of human nature, that the greatest blessings bestowed on us through the agency of uninspired men, are commonly accompanied with a mixture of evil. The most salutary changes are often carried beyond their proper limits: and principles, which are sound and just under the control of prudence and moderation, when pushed to extremities, and acted upon without discretion, are pregnant with dangerous consequences; and sometimes produce errors almost as pernicious as those which they are intended to counteract.

We find proofs of this position in the history of the Reformation. A spirit of opposition to the Church of Rome, originating in the best causes, and

intimately connected with the vital interests of religion, was sometimes carried to an excess, inconsistent with truth and sobriety. In combating the errors of that Church, theologians lost sight of the landmarks which had been transgressed, and swept away with an unsparing hand opinions and customs, which had been universally received in the best ages of Christianity. Released from the bondage which had been imposed on the human understanding, men of pious and ardent spirits seemed to think that Scripture was a book from which every man was at liberty to deduce his theological system, and paid little regard to the testimony of their forefathers in the faith, and the most received interpretations of Holy Writ, if they interfered with their own favourite opinions. For they appear to have forgotten, that though tradition is of no value when opposed to the plain sense of Scripture, or entirely independent of Scriptural arguments and conclusions, the testimony which the primitive Church bears to the received doctrines of Christianity, and the received interpretation of Scripture, is, on principles of common sense and critical investigation, of great weight and importance.

This cause seems to have operated in alienating the minds of many Protestant Divines from those doctrinal views of the Sacrament of Baptism, which had been maintained in the Church from its earliest

days, since it led them to confound the true theory of Baptism with the errors which the Romish Church had engrafted on it. For this departure from the sound and primitive doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, was in great measure owing to an inordinate jealousy of that pernicious doctrine of this Church, that Sacraments confer Grace, (to use the language of Schools,) *ex opere operato*. For the doctrine of the Church of Rome was, that Sacraments operate upon the soul by a divine virtue communicated to the elements, and that, where there is no positive obstacle of wilful sin, they confer grace without any corresponding act on the part of the recipient. Not to mention the practical consequences of this doctrine in the case of the Lord's Supper, it gave an impress of superstition to the Sacrament of Baptism, and led to absurd and mischievous practices. For the Ministers of that Communion thought themselves justified in baptizing heathens, who were ignorant of the first truths of Christianity, even those who were compelled by violence to profess a faith, which they renounced and hated in their hearts.

But the divines of whom we are speaking, in the warmth of their opposition to this pernicious error, were induced to reject the truth on which it had been grafted. They contended that the notion, that baptized persons are actually regenerated and

justified in Baptism¹, is the identical heresy of the Romanists; that Baptism is indeed a seal of Regeneration, either already bestowed, or to be bestowed perhaps at some future season, but that none except actual believers are really justified or regenerated. But the true doctrine of the Church was, not that "Christ and the Holy Ghost are in the water or font²," nor that they are given promiscuously to all comers; "but that they are given in the ministration to them that be duly baptized in water;" that adults are not duly baptized, unless qualified by belief and repentance: that Regeneration itself is a pure act of God's grace, limited by his word to a particular rite, and connected with a symbolical action; and that though it implies and requires, it does not necessarily suppose, that future newness of life, which is the joint act of man and the Holy Spirit.

¹ *Apage hunc errorem operis operati. Incipit baptismi fructus ab eo momento quo fides incipit, quæ interdum præcedit Baptismum, interdum subsequitur. Beza G.*

Ad infantes quod attinet in Ecclesiâ natos et divinitus Electos, et antequam usum intelligendi nacti sunt, morituros, facile existimârim, verbo Dei fretus, *nascendo inseri Christo*. De cæteris vero quid aliter statuere nisi apertissimâ temeritate possum, quàm tum demum regenerari cùm fide verà ex auditu donantur? Beza G. p. 103.

This is certainly more reasonable and consistent doctrine, than that view of Regeneration which supposes that some infants are regenerated in Baptism, and others not.

² Archbishop Cranmer.

Another cause of this departure from the doctrine of the Church, was the great stress which these divines laid upon faith, as an instrument of salvation, independently of all other moral qualifications, and collateral and subordinate instruments. Arguing from those passages of Scripture, in which faith is insisted on without any allusion to Baptism, they concluded that every believer, whether baptized or not, is justified and regenerated; and that Baptism is nothing more than a kind of appendage to belief, and a certificate to the soul of the believer, of grace already received. On the same ground they contended that no one baptized in infancy is justified or born again till he has acted an act of faith, and applied Christ to himself. But they seem to have forgotten that negative arguments cannot invalidate positive proofs and testimonies. If Christ has ordained Baptism as a sacrament through which salvation—that is, pardon of sin, and the gift of the Holy Ghost—is to be made over to us, the binding force and virtue of this ordinance cannot be shaken or extenuated by passages of Scripture in which faith alone is mentioned and insisted on. Many of these passages record circumstances which took place, and sayings which were uttered before the solemn and authoritative institution of Baptism; and the preceding law must be qualified and explained by the subsequent statute. And when the

Apostles insist on faith as the great requisite to salvation, they could not intend to annul their Lord's ordinance, nor to deny the necessity or to call in question the virtue of this sacrament. "They draw very near to this error," (the error of the Valentinian heretics,) "who fixing wholly their minds on the known necessity of faith, imagine that nothing but faith is necessary to the attainment of grace. Yet it is a branch of belief, that sacraments are in their place no less required than belief itself. For when our Lord and Saviour promiseth eternal life, is it any otherwise than he promised restitution of health unto Naaman the Syrian, namely, with this condition, *Wash and be clean*³?"

Another reason which induced many Theologians of the reformed Churches to renounce the ancient doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, was their attachment to an opinion of late growth in the Church, that true grace is indefectible. The ancient predestinarians never questioned the certainty of Regeneration in Baptism, because this doctrine was consistent with their theory. For though they maintained that only the elect or predestinate are endued with the gift of perseverance to the end, and will be finally saved, yet they believed that God bestows at his pleasure every other kind and measure of grace on those persons, from whom He

³ Hooker, Eccl. Pol. l. 5. c. 60. p. 249.

withholds this special grace of perseverance⁴. They therefore held, in common with the rest of the Church, that the forgiveness of sin and the gift of the Holy Ghost are generally bestowed in Baptism, because they did not conceive that there is any necessary and indissoluble connexion between Regeneration and eternal salvation. This was Augustin's doctrine, whose opinion was, that grace, however limited in its operation and duration, is nevertheless true grace, and the exact counterpart of a decree of predestination enacted before the world began. This doctrine had its defenders and opponents both among Romish and Protestant divines. It was adopted by Luther, at least in the early part of his career, but was disliked and discountenanced by Melancthon⁵, and was rejected by the Lutheran Church. And it certainly received no favour nor encouragement from those great men who took the leading part in the Reformation of our own Church. But it was so little disliked by the Church of Rome, that it was acknowledged in the Council of Trent, that in the matter of predestination there is nothing

⁴ *Mirandum est quidem multumque mirandum, quod quibusdam filiis suis, quos regeneravit in Christo, quibus fidem, dilectionem dedit, not dat perseverantiam. Augustin, De Corr. et Gratia, c. 9.*

⁵ *Nimis horridæ fuerunt initio Stoicæ disputationes apud nostros de Fato; et disciplinæ nocuerunt. Melancthon, Ep. ad Cranmer.*

unsound in the writings of Luther, and the adherents to the Augsburg Confession; and the decrees of that Council are framed in such a manner as not to offend the schoolmen, who were of Augustin's sentiments⁶.

But the Calvinistic doctrine of indefectible grace was incompatible with the received notion of Regeneration in Baptism. For it is evident, that final salvation is no necessary consequence of Baptism. But according to the principles of Calvin and his followers, no one, who has been washed from his sins, and endowed with the Holy Ghost, can possibly fail of everlasting happiness⁷. They therefore re-

⁶ On this head, they found nothing to censure in the writings of Luther, nor in the Augsburg Confession, nor in the Apologies and Confessions. But they found much to censure in the writings of the Zuinglians. Paolo, l. 2. s. 80.

Nemo, quamdiu in hâc mortalitate vivit, de arcano divinæ prædestinationis consilio usque adeo præsumere debet, ut certo statuât se omninò esse in numero prædestinatorum: quasi verum esset quòd justificatus amplius peccare non possit, aut si peccaverit, certam sibi resipiscentiam promittere debeat. Nam sine speciali revelatione sciri non potest quos Deus sibi elegerit. Con. Tri. Sess. 6. c. 13.

Similiter de perseverantiæ munere nemo sibi certi aliquid absolutâ certitudine polliceatur. C. 14.

⁷ Fieri non potest, ut qui Spiritûs Sancti ope ita Christo unitus fuerit, ut unus cum illo Spiritus evaserit, in Christum credere suo tempore vel negligat, vel deinceps etiam desinat. Gataker, p. 150.

Cui non Orthodoxo mirum, si non horrendum dictu, videatur, aliquem in Christi mortem sepultum, Christo incorporatum,

jected the doctrine of the universal Church, in deference to their own theory—a theory flattering to the pride and presumption of the human heart, but manifestly at variance with the whole truth of Scripture, and the first principles of natural religion.

But besides, in their zeal for this tenet of absolute election and infallible perseverance, they were too ready to overlook the means through which the decree of predestination, whatever may be its nature, must be carried into effect; or, at least, to think little of those means which, in the opinion of sober judges, are subordinately instrumental to salvation. This is an error which has been treated with his usual judgment and good sense by Hooker. But his mode of arguing did not satisfy the zealous Calvinists. For finding no mention of Baptism in that text of Scripture, which they looked upon as the charter or golden chain of man's salvation⁸,

Christo indutum, in æternum posthac exitium devenire? Idem, p. 157.

⁸ Rom. viii. 28, 29, 30. This passage is evidently intended to point out, not the necessary and infallible event, but the order, design, and intention of God's counsels. In fact, the aorist, or indefinite tense, often denotes the frequency and customary occurrence, and the order, design, and regular or legitimate event of things, and in the idiom of our language may be more correctly rendered by the present tense—*Whom he foreknows, &c.* So Luke i. 51, 52, 53. The words, *whom he justifies he glorifies*, have been commonly quoted as decisive of the doctrine of indefectible grace and necessary perseverance. But it seems.

they extenuated its importance, and were far from regarding it as an immediate and ordinary means of life. "There are," says Hooker, "that elevate⁹ too much the ordinary and immediate means of life, relying wholly upon the bare conceit of that eternal election, which, notwithstanding, includeth a subordination of means, without which we are not actually brought to enjoy what God secretly did intend. Predestination bringeth not life without vocation, wherein our Baptism is implied. For as we are not naturally men without birth, so neither are we Christian men in the eye of the Church of God but by new birth; nor according to the manifest ordinary course of divine dispensation, new born,

to have been forgotten, that a large part of the New Testament is taken up in calling justified men to the performance of those duties through which they must attain to glory; in warning them of the danger to which they were exposed of falling away from grace, and exhorting them to *seek for glory, honour, and immortality by patient continuance in well-doing*. In this passage, the Apostle encourages the Roman Christians to perseverance, by assuring them that the whole plan and order of their salvation has been laid down and appointed by God from eternity; and that as their call and justification are plain proofs of their predestination to life, so they are pledges of the continuance of God's favour, and of eternal glory, if they on their part remain *stedfast in the faith*, and continue to *love God*, to *suffer with Christ*, and to *walk not after the flesh but after the Spirit*.

⁹ The word *elevate* is here used in the classical sense of the Latin word *elevo*; and signifies to *undervalue*, or *take off from the force of*.

but by Baptism, which both *declareth and maketh* us Christians. In which respect we justly hold it to be the door of our actual entrance into God's house, the first apparent beginning of life, a seal perhaps to the grace of election before received, but to our sanctification here a step that hath not any before it¹."

For these reasons the theologians of whom we are speaking relinquished the opinion of Catholic Christianity on this subject, and brought forward several propositions, directly opposed to the creed which had been maintained for so many ages.

1. That Baptism is not, properly speaking, a means or instrument of grace, but merely a sign or seal of regeneration and forgiveness.

2. That believers in Christ receive remission of their sins and are born again, previous to the Sacrament of Baptism.

3. That infants, though baptized with water, are not baptized with the Spirit, till they are endowed with faith and with effectual and indefectible grace.

4. That none but the Elect are ever regenerate; that the Elect, when effectually called, are regenerate without Baptism; and that every elect and regenerate person must necessarily be saved.

¹ Hooker. *Fool* Pol. b. 5. c. 60, p. 247, 248.

5. That Infants, who are the children of believers, are not received into covenant with God in Baptism, but are baptized because they are already within the covenant of adoption².

Regeneration, therefore, being thus separated from Baptism, was invested with a new character and new definitions, and a different place was assigned to it, according to the new theory, from that which it had obtained in the creed and practice of our forefathers.

² Sancta ideo nascitur ex fidelibus progenies, quod adhuc utero inclusi eorum liberi, antequam vitalem Spiritum haurirent, cooptati tamen sunt in fœdus vitæ æternæ. Nec sane alio jure per Baptismum aggregantur in ecclesiam, nisi quia ad corpus Christi jam ante pertinebant, quam in lucem ederentur. Baptismum præcedat adoptionis gratia necesse est, quæ non dimidiæ tantùm salutis causa est, sed eam ipsam salutem in solidum affert, quæ Baptismo deinde sancitur. Calvin, *Vera Eccles. Reformandæ Ratio*. Opuscula, p. 325.

This is the common doctrine of the Calvinistic writers, and they ground it on God's promise to Abraham, that He would be *a God to him and his seed after him*. Infantes nostros antequam nascentur se adoptare in suos pronuntiat Deus, quum se nobis in Deum fore promittit, seminique nostro post nos. But even allowing the justness of this argument from Abraham's case to our own, God's promise to *his* seed implied and included circumcision. That the children of Christians have a title to Baptism and its benefits by birthright, as Abraham's descendants had to Circumcision, and that it is the duty of parents to see that they are baptized, is readily allowed. But I apprehend that our Church speaks more consonantly to Scripture, than Calvin and his followers, when it determines that we are *made children of God and children of grace, or made his children by adoption and grace*, in Baptism.

But, before I proceed to inquire into the value of this theory, I shall enter a little more particularly into the history of those variations in language and opinion upon this subject, to which I briefly alluded in an early part of my inquiry.

The word *Regeneration* is used by Melancthon in his public and private writings, as equivalent to justification, in the sense which this latter word bears in the controversial parts of St. Paul's Epistles, and in the controversial writings of the early Protestants. This sense of the word represents the true theory of *Regeneration*, but it gives it a latitude inconsistent with the usage of Scripture, and the more correct statements of the ancient Christians³. For, instead of confining it to that

³ *Justificari significat, ex injustis justos effici, seu regenerari. Melancthon, vol. i. p. 66.*

Ex his omnibus apparet, quod sola fides justificat—et quod sola fides regenerat. Nam solâ fide concipitur Spiritus Sanctus. p. 71.

Qui hanc fidem consecuti sunt, hi renati sunt, ut bene operentur, et legem faciant. p. 78.

Fides consequitur remissionem peccatorum, et justificat nos, et regenerat, et affert Spiritum Sanctum, ut deinde legem facere possimus. p. 64.

Hæc est regeneratio, de quâ hic concionatur Christus, (John iii. 5.) cum hoc modo fiduciâ Filii Dei in pavoribus sustentamur, et liberamur a terroribus peccati, et ab æternâ morte. Vol. iii. p. 94.

Disputatio est (John iii. 3, &c.) de discrimine justitiæ legalis,

reconciliation which takes place in Baptism, the first translation from a state of wrath into a state of grace and acceptance, it makes it include the reconciliation of the sinner to God in every part of his religious life. Justification, like Regeneration, is distinct in theory from conversion, or the renewal of the inward frame, and does not, strictly speaking, consist in a change of mind, (for in adults that change, i. e. repentance, must precede it,) but in a change of relative condition to God, and a free grant of privileges and mercies; including in its definition the forgiveness of sin, the acceptance of the person, and a conditional title to eternal life. Thus far, therefore, it agrees with Regeneration; and every worthy recipient, according to the constant

et justitiæ fidei, quâ verè tollitur peccatum et mors, et fit regeneratio, et inchoatio vitæ æternæ. Idem.

This appears to have been the current doctrine of the Lutheran divines; or rather they speak of faith as the effect of Regeneration.

“*Propria et maxime genuina et hodie apud Theologos præcipue usitata (hujus vocis) significatio est, quâ fidei perductionem denotat.*” *Baddeus Inst. Theol. Dogm. l. iv. c. 3. 15.*

But they distinguished between the act and state of Regeneration; i. e. between Regeneration and Renovation.

Ne vero distinguenda confundamus, discrimen inter actum et statum regenerationis minime est negligendum: sed et quæ ad gradus et incrementa novi hominis, adeoque ad renovationem spectant, a primâ ejus productione quæ fit in regeneratione, probè sunt discernenda. c. 3. 23.

doctrine of the Church, is not only regenerated, but justified in Baptism. But in many respects Justification differs from Regeneration⁴.

In Regeneration God is considered as a father, adopting us for his children, and bringing us into a state of new life. In Justification He is spoken of as a judge or moral governor, passing sentence upon us, and pronouncing us just and righteous.

Regeneration is a single act of God's grace, conveyed over to us at a determinate time, and in a form specially appointed by Christ. Its privileges and good effects may be suspended, and in the end utterly forfeited; but cannot, humanly speaking, be totally lost in this world, because every person, who has been born again of water and of the Spirit, is, till he dies, within the covenant of repentance. But, if we except the case of infants, the being accounted just and righteous in God's sight is a blessing which depends on the actual condition of the heart and habits; and no man is justified who has not forsaken his sins, and is not living in a state of habitual belief and holiness, and compliance with the will of God. Hence, as Augustin⁵ has well remarked, man is jus-

⁴ See Waterland's Sermon on Justification.

⁵ *Justificatio porro in hac vitâ nobis secundum tria ista confertur. Prius lavacro regenerationis quo remittuntur peccata omnia. Deinde congressu cum vitiis, a quorum reatu absoluti sumus. Tertiò, cum nostra exauditur oratio, quâ dicimus, Dimitte nobis debita nostra—quoniam quamlibet fortiter contra*

tified in Baptism, and continues to be justified whilst he is contending strenuously against sin, and praying for the forgiveness of his daily trespasses. But the same qualifications that are required of adult converts, in order to their Justification in Baptism, are required of the Christian sinner who has departed from grace, in order to forgiveness and justification. Justification, therefore, is a blessing which may be lost by man's sin, and recovered through God's mercy. For as our Church teaches us, in perfect conformity to Scripture, "The grant of repentance is not to be denied to such as fall into sin after Baptism. After we have received the Holy Ghost, we may depart from grace given, and fall into sin: and by the grace of God, we may rise again, and amend ourselves⁶."

But though Melancthon and the Lutheran divines used the word Regeneration in this latitude, and in the more popular sense of conversion or renovation⁷, they maintained with steadiness the doctrine of

vitia dimicemus, homines sumus; Dei autem gratia sic nos in hâc corruptibili carne adjuvat dimicantes, ut non desit propter quod exaudiat veniam postulantes. Augustin, contra Julianum, lib. ii. ed. Paris, vol. vii. p. 1555.

⁶ Article XVI.

⁷ Cum de tali fide loquamur, quæ a morte liberat, et novam vitam in cordibus parit, et est opus Spiritûs Sancti, non stat cum peccato mortali, sed tantisper dum adest bonos fructus parit. Quid potest dici de *conversione impii*, seu de *modo regenerationis* clarius? Melancthon, vol. i. p. 65.

Regeneration in Baptism⁸. They taught, consistently with the language and doctrine of our own Church, that the guilt or formality of sin is removed in Baptism, though the material part of it, (to use the language of the schools,) that is, concupiscence, or proneness to evil, still remains: and that the Holy Ghost is given to us at the same time, to mortify our concupiscence, and to produce new and godly motions within us.

The opinions delivered by Calvin on this subject do not appear altogether steady and consistent. He identifies Regeneration with conversion, repentance, or renewal⁹. According to this defini-

⁸ See Archbishop Laurence, Part i. c. 4.

Semper ita scripsit Lutherus, quod Baptismus tollat reatum peccati originis, etsi materiale, ut isti vocant, peccati maneat—id est, concupiscentia. Addit etiam de materiali, quod Spiritus Sanctus per Baptismum datus, incipit mortificare concupiscentiam, et novos motus creat in homine. Mel. vol. i. p. 61.

Quod Deus approbat baptismum parvulorum, hoc ostendit, quod Deus dat Spiritum Sanctum sic baptizatis. p. 83.

Deducit Christus nos (John iii. 5.) ad ministerium Evangelii, quasi dicat—Intelligo te, Nicodeme, offendi novis concionibus meis et Baptistæ, quod dicimus vestris exercitiis et disciplinâ non tolli peccatum: sed hoc prorsus affirmo, teque ad hoc novum ministerium deduco. Renasci te oportet per hoc novum ministerium Baptismi, qui fit aquâ et Spiritu. Vol. iii. p. 641.

⁹ *Regenerationem dico esse veram ad Deum vitæ nostræ conversionem, a sincero serioque Dei timore profectam, quæ carnis nostræ veterisque hominis mortificatione, et Spiritus vivificatione constat. Calvin, Inst. l. iii. c. 3.]*

Uno ergo verbo pœnitentiam interpretor regenerationem, cujus

tion, Regeneration is a true conversion of the soul to God, proceeding from a sincere and serious fear of Him, and consisting of the mortification of the flesh and the old man, and of the quickening or renewal of the Spirit. This change is necessary that the image of God, which had been obliterated in Adam, may be formed again in the soul of man. And this renewal, or Regeneration, is not completed in one moment, or day, or year; but God abolishes the corruptions of the flesh in the elect, by continued and slow advances.

But he affirms, that Baptism is the ordinary instrument of Regeneration and renovation¹; that

non alius est scopus, nisi ut imago Dei, quæ per Adæ transgressionem foedata, et tantum non oblitterata fuerat, in nobis reformetur. Idem.

Proinde istâ regeneratione in Dei justitiam Christi beneficio instauramur. Atque hæc quidem instauratio non uno momento, vel die, vel anno impletur, sed per continuos, imo etiam lentos interdum profectus abolet Deus in Electis suis carnis corrumpelas. Idem.

¹ *Sacramenta nihil sunt quam instrumentales conferendæ gratiæ causæ, quæ tum demùm prosunt suumque effectum habent, cum fidei inserviunt. Calv. Antid. C. T. Opuscula, p. 296.*

Nec fideles modò astringimus ad ejus observationem: sed ordinarium quoque Dei instrumentum esse asserimus ad nos lavandos et renovandos, ad salutem denique nobis communicandam. p. 298.

In baptismo Deus Filii sui sanguine nos abluit, suoque Spiritu nos regenerat. p. 297.

Hæc tesserâ voluntatem suam Dominus nobis testificatur,

it is an instrumental cause of conferring grace; that in Baptism God washes us with the blood of his Son, and regenerates us with his Spirit; that in this sacrament He effectually fulfils what it figures out and represents. And He declares his total disapprobation of the sentiments of those persons who deny that sacraments contain the grace which they symbolize. At the same time, He strictly confines this grace of Regeneration to the elect, that is, to those persons whose salvation is secured by an absolute and unconditional decree; and asserts, that the man who does not know that the Spirit of Regeneration is only conferred on the elect, is totally unacquainted with Scripture ². Yet in other passages, he seems to confine the office of sacraments

neque tantum nudo spectaculo pascit oculos, sed in rem præsentem nos adducit, et quod figurat efficaciter simul implet. Inst. l. iv. c. 15.

Si qui sunt qui negant Sacramentis contineri gratiam quam significant, improbamus. Opusc. p. 296.

Quum autem vera sunt quæ nobis Dominus dedit gratiæ suæ testimonia et sigilla vere procul dubio præstat intus Spiritu suo, quod oculis et aliis sensibus figurant sacramenta. Consensio Min. Eccl. Tigur. et J. Calvin. Opusc. p. 753.

² Sedulò docemus, Deum non promiscue vim suam exercere in omnibus qui Sacramenta recipiunt, sed tantum in electis. Consensio, s. 16.

Hoc interest in Dei vocatione, quod omnes promiscue invitat verbo suo, electos autem solos intus docet. Quemadmodum ait Christus, *Quicquid mihi dedit Pater, ad me veniet*. Denique regenerationis Spiritum non dari nisi Electis, quisquis ignorat nescio quid in Scripturis teneat. Ant. C. T. Opusc. 291.

to sealing and testifying; and declares, that God regenerates those who have been baptized in infancy, sometimes in childhood, sometimes in youth, sometimes in extreme old age³.

This was one of the earliest attempts to separate Regeneration from Baptism⁴; and these opinions are consequences of his favourite notions of predestination, and of the indefectibility and necessary activity of true grace. But though Calvin seems to have departed with reluctance from the received doctrine and language of the Church, the opinions, which he advanced with some caution and reserve, were avowed and defended by the great body of his followers. According to the doctrine of the Church, the sacramental phraseology is founded on

³ Hic præcipuus Sacramentorum usus est, ut per ea nobis gratiam suam testetur Deus, figuret, repræsentet. Consensio, 753.

Tametsi in contextu verborum Baptismus remissionem peccatorum hic præcedit, ordine tamen sequitur, quia nihil aliud est quam bonorum quæ per Christum consequimur obsignatio, ut in conscientiiis nostris rata sint. Quia autem Baptismus sigillum est, quo Deus hoc nobis confirmat, adeoque arrha et pignus adoptionis nostræ, merito dari in remissionem peccatorum dicitur. Calv. in Act. 2. 38.

Qui in primâ infantia baptizati sunt, eos in pueritiâ, vel ineunte adolescentiâ, interdum etiam in senectute regenerat Deus. Consensio, s. 19.

⁴ The attempt had been made in an earlier period of the Reformation by Zuinglius, who seems to have maintained these opinions with greater decision and consistency than his successor, Calvin. See Dr. Pusey's Scriptural view.

the conjunction and simultaneous presence of the sign and the thing signified⁵; and sacraments not only denote, but confer grace, in a subordinate and instrumental manner. But the Calvinistic divines put a different interpretation on these phrases. For they affirmed, that sacraments confer grace in a manner peculiar to themselves, not as means whereby grace is transmitted to the recipient, but as signs or seals of grace already received⁶. They

⁵ Sacramentales locutiones fundantur in conjunctâ collatione et exhibitione rei signatæ cum signo, in usu legitimo ex institutione Christi. Ward, p. 101. G.

⁶ Baptismus filios Dei non facit, sed qui jam ante filii Dei sunt, filiorum Dei testimonium signum vel tesseram accipiunt. Zuinglius, prior to Calvin. G. p. 96.

Baptismus est obsignatio promissionis acquisitæ et sigillum jam impetratæ regenerationis. Peter Martyr. G.

Sacramenta in adultis nisi renatis jam et renovatis non applicant Christi meritum. Gat.

Consentiunt Sacramenta esse signa exhibentia id quod significant. Nam quæ diplomata in membranâ sunt, fiunt efficacia, sortiunturque effectum suum. Chamier, Panstr. G. 93.

Baptismatis aqua neque ut causa efficiens, neque ut instrumentalis, requiritur, sed duntaxat ut obsignatorium sigillum. Danæus. G. p. 92.

Contrarium dogma ex foetidis Scholasticorum lacunis haustum est, qui causativam, ut loquuntur, vim Deo principalem, instrumentalem Sacramentis tribuerunt. Beza. G. 105.

Adultus fidelis quivis ad fontem sacrum accedit, peccatorum retro commissorum omnium remissionem plenariam, et internam regenerationem jam consecutus. Gat. p. 95.

considered what St. Paul says of Abraham's circumcision as a complete definition of a sacrament⁷. For as Abraham *received the sign of circumcision, the seal of the righteousness of faith, which he had yet being uncircumcised*, so, in their opinion, every believer receives the sign of Baptism, the seal of the righteousness of faith, which he had yet being unbaptized. They did not, however, remark that there can be no analogy between the case of Abraham, whose faith, as we learn from Scripture, was counted to him for righteousness long before he received the covenant of circumcision, and of Christians, the express words of whose charter are, *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*.

But since this theory and definition of Baptism could not cover the case of infants, to solve this difficulty they resorted to a distinction arising out

⁷ Vix puto ullum locum extare in sacris literis, quo tam breviter et explicate natura Sacramentorum explicatur, quam his Pauli verbis ubi Circumcisio appellatur signaculum. Pet. Martyr, in Rom. iv. 11. G.

Porro hic habemus insignem locum de communi Sacramentorum usu. Sunt enim, teste Paulo, sigilla; quibus Dei promissiones cordibus nostris quodammodò obsignantur, et sancitur gratiæ certitudo. Calv. in Rom. iv. 11.

Nec vero Baptismo plus tribuere fas est, quàm Apostolus circumcisioni tribuit, quod vocat *sigillum justitiæ fidei*. Calv. Inst. l. iv. c. 14. § 25.

Non hic circumcisionis tantum, sed Sacramentorum in genere definitio habetur. Whitaker. G.

of the nature and use of seals^a. "Seals," they said, "are sometimes affixed to legal instruments in confirmation of grants already bestowed; sometimes in testimony of grants which are to be made good at some future time. It is in the latter way that Baptism confers grace on elect infants, because it is a seal of that grace which God will bestow on them in his own season." Had it, however, been certain that this figurative expression, in Scriptural usage, is borrowed from seals affixed to legal instruments, it is reasonable to suppose that it would not have been taken from the accidental and occasional, but from the ordinary use of legal seals. Now, though seals are sometimes affixed to grants or conveyances of property, of which the party is already in full possession, and sometimes to conveyances of reversionary or contingent interests, the ordinary use of legal instruments is to convey and give present possession of property or privileges; and these instruments have no legal validity till they are sealed. Hence, if Baptism is a seal of grace, in the sense to which we are alluding, it is

^a *Moralis signi usus est promiscuus, ad effecta tum præterita, tum futura. Sigilla in rebus politicis confirmant tum pacta jam statuta, tum promissa in futurum.* Chamier, Panstr. G. 95.

Obsignatur remissio, vel collata baptizato, vel conferenda deinceps: sive cum adultus actualiter conversus crediderit, sive priusquam hinc discesserit, si parvulus adhuc obierit. Gataker, p. 96, speaking of infants.

more natural, and more consistent with the common principles of figurative language, to consider it as a seal of grace conveyed and made over by the act of sealing, than of grace already bestowed, or only promised and contingent.

But though Calvin used the word Regeneration rather in a popular than in its strict and appropriate meaning, his notions of the thing itself were sober and moderate. For he supposes that Regeneration proceeds from the fear of God, and includes in its definition the whole conversion of the life to God, commencing either in Baptism, or in some other season, without speculating on the nature and extent of this turning point, or commencement of Regeneration. But his followers confined the act of Regeneration to a determinate time, and took their description of it from the scholastic doctrine of justifying grace⁹. For, according to the schoolmen, man, when he is baptized, is endowed with a habit of justifying grace, containing in it the habits of faith, hope, and charity, and of all Christian virtues.

⁹ In ipsâ justificatione hæc omnia simul infusa accipit homo, spem, fidem, caritatem. Conc. Trid. Sessio Sexta, S. 5. 8.

Grace is said by the schoolmen to be a *spiritual quality, created by God*. They maintained that the perfection of Adam consisted in an infused quality, which adorned his soul, and rendered it perfect; that God, through the merits of Christ, gives to those who are born again in Baptism another quality, which is called justifying grace, which, by purifying the soul of all its stains, renders it as pure as that of Adam. Paulo, l. ii. c. 64.

But the scholastic Calvinists asserted that Regeneration consists in such a habit of grace bestowed on the elect in the moment of the effectual call. Regeneration, according to their statement, "is the implanting the habits and principles of grace, or the framing the complexion or body of grace in the heart. It is a constellation of all the several graces of the Spirit in the heart; and all these graces of the Holy Spirit are implanted in us at once in the very instant of our Regeneration, for they are all linked together, and whoever receives one grace receives them all. It is a change of the whole man, in every part and faculty thereof, from a state of sinful nature to a state of supernatural grace, whereby the image of God, which was defaced and lost by our first transgression, is in some measure restored. This image of God, which is restored to us in Regeneration, has a perfection of parts, though not of degrees, and it can never be totally lost and effaced as the other was: for though the sins of the elect may blot the evidences of their Regeneration, they cannot annul the certainty of their salvation ¹."

In the next Chapter I shall examine particularly the grounds and reasonableness of this theory, and

¹ This statement is taken from Bishop Hopkins, vol. ii. p. 475, &c. London, 8vo. The doctrinal works of this prelate are a kind of digest of Calvinistic common places. See Cat. Syn. Trident. part ii. c. 2. 50, 51.

inquire whether it has any advantage over the theory of our Church and the ancient Christians. At present I shall only observe, that this scholastic notion of a habit of grace involves two innovations on the known and received use of words.

The ancient moralists make a just and reasonable distinction between faculties or dispositions, and habits². Faculties or dispositions are potential principles of action, which must be elicited by education, or opportunities, and formed into habits by use and exercise. Habits are the same principles in a state of activity, and of readiness and aptness for use. But, according to the doctrine of the scholastic divines, those principles which are said to be infused into the soul when it is regenerated, do not follow the order of moral causes, but are at once in a state of activity, and produce free acts as soon as they have an opportunity of exerting themselves. But we shall see by-and-by that there is no ground of reason or Scripture for supposing that spiritual causes differ from moral in the order of their operations, or in the manner in which they produce their practical effects.

The other innovation upon language consists in the sense which they have affixed to the word *grace*, considering it as a habit or quality inherent in the soul of man³. *Grace* is a word used in a

² Aristotle, *Nicom. Ethic.* l. ii. c. 1 and 4.

³ χάρις.

variety of senses in Scripture: but, whenever it is applied to the renewal and spiritual improvement of the human soul, it always signifies some favour or mercy proceeding from God, of which man is the object. In popular language, those virtues and good qualities which we refer upward to God, as their principal cause, are often called, by a common figure of speech, *graces*. But the schoolmen built a metaphysical distinction on this figure of speech, and distributed grace into real and relative, objective and subjective: relative grace, of which man is the object—adoption, for instance, and the forgiveness of sins—which alters the relation in which he stands to God: real grace, of which man is the subject, which is a quality inherent in himself, and consists in the creation or infusion of new habits, and an entire change of the inward frame and dispositions. This is what the schoolmen call justifying grace; the scholastic Calvinists regenerating grace, or Regeneration. But as this distinction has no foundation in Scriptural language, so we shall see that the doctrine which it insinuates has no foundation in the reason of the thing, experience, or Scripture.

There are some divines, who, using the word *Regeneration* much in the same sense, and at all events separating it from Baptism, do not think it necessary to confine the change signified by it to any turning point, or particular moment of time. But

there does not seem to be any material difference of opinion between them and the divines, whose sentiments have been just now stated. A gradual renewal of the mind and formation of habits, a change from evil to good, or from good to better, is often called Regeneration, in an enlarged sense of the word, by theologians, who still adhere, if not to the phraseology, to the doctrine of the ancient Christians, in the matter of Baptism. But I do not apprehend that the divines, to whom I allude, consider Regeneration as a moral change, produced by causes operating in a moral manner. If by this word they denote the whole process of renovation ⁴, *necessarily* advancing onward, without any *material or fatal* interruption, from some determinate point, of which reason and conscience can take no cognizance, this notion involves the unscriptural doctrine of the indefectibility of true grace. If it is only meant that the entire change of mind, or infusion of habits, does not necessarily take place in a particular instant, but may be extended to a larger compass and period of time, this variation implies some deference to common sense, but, in the most material respects, coincides with the opinion of the scholastic Calvinists.

Some writers, indeed, who speak of Regeneration as a gradual process effected by the Spirit of God,

⁴ This, as we have seen above, is Calvin's doctrine.

appear, nevertheless, to make a distinction between Regeneration and conversion, and contend that Regeneration is the immediate operation of the Holy Ghost upon the soul, conversion the voluntary act of the mind turning itself to God. But as neither conversion, nor any other moral and religious change can be effected without the operation of the Holy Ghost, so I find no ground for supposing that the renewal of the inward frame takes place, in the ordinary course of God's dealings with us, without the agency of man's will and faculties. Certainly this subtle attempt to split the joint act of the Spirit and the man into two separate acts, independent of each other in theory, cannot be defended on Scriptural principles.

But though the Calvinistic theology had separated Regeneration from Baptism, and described it as an infusion of habits, an implantation of grace, or a radical change of all the parts and faculties of the soul, it did not represent it as immediately and necessarily discernible, but left it to be discovered by its moral effects, or by certain criteria which it laid down as the best and most infallible signs of true grace. Men of warm constitutions, however, often spoke of this change as something sensible and palpable; and the definitions which were given of it, combined with those notions of faith which were entertained by many of the early Protestants, naturally betrayed them into this error.

For when it is once supposed that faith is a certain knowledge and full assurance of our own individual favour with God ⁵, or of our own absolute predestination to eternal life, and that Regeneration is *an infusion of* (what is called) *habitual grace*, or *an entire change of soul*, effected at some turning point,

⁵ It was the common doctrine of the Lutherans, maintained even by Melancthon himself, that the faith which justifies is an assured persuasion of our own *personal* forgiveness and favour. Calvin adopted this opinion, and incorporated with it his own doctrine of the indefectibility of grace ; so that according to him the faith which justifies is an assured persuasion of our *personal and everlasting* salvation. See Inst. l. iii. c. 2. Many of his followers saw the absurdity of this definition, and its palpable contradiction to Scripture, which teaches us that faith must precede justification. They therefore made a distinction between justifying and special faith, and supposed that the one depends upon the other in the way of logical conclusion. Dr. S. Ward * treats the doctrine of justification by a *special* faith, or persuasion of our own *personal* forgiveness and acceptance, as a Lutheran error.

This notion of justification by a special faith, or a persuasion of our own *personal* forgiveness and acceptance, is a leading doctrine of Whitfield, Wesley, and all the Methodistical sects, and exactly coincides with their views of Regeneration ; which in their system is separate from justification in theory and the order of thought, though not in fact or the order of time.

* Samuelis Ward, S. T. D. Opera nonnulla.

Tractatus de fide justificante et speciali, c. 23, p. 201.

Operæ pretium duximus eorum opinionem oppugnare, qui fiduciam de peccatorum remissione esse ipsam fidem justificantem contendunt : quæ fere est assertio Lutheranorum.

or, at the utmost, within a short compass of time, the barrier between these opinions and enthusiasm, however firm it may appear to speculative Theologians, is weak and inconsiderable. Hence the theoretical error of these divines, when it fell into the hands of the unthinking, the injudicious, and the passionate, naturally slid into a practical error and a fanatical conceit; especially when it was set off in the exaggerated colours of eloquence, or exhibited to the understanding in the incongruous form of rhetorical definitions. A new birth, distinctly perceivable by the conscience and feelings of the individual, accompanied with throes and agonies, and bearing in every respect a close analogy to the natural birth, has become, as might have been expected, the favourite tenet and strong hold of fanaticism. Indeed the theory of those who contend that this new birth is sensible, and of those who speak of it in more guarded language, is precisely the same; and there is no difference in their views of the nature or necessity of that change which they designate by this term. But the more sober-minded advocates of this opinion maintain that the change is not perceived at the very moment when it takes place, because it is not expected. Whereas, in the system of the enthusiasts, it is expected, and therefore, as they contend, is perceived. The mind of the aspirant is postured into the different stages of spiritual parturition, and he is brought to the

birth (to use their own phraseology) sooner or later, if we will believe themselves, as the Spirit listeth; as thinking and observing men will probably judge, in proportion to his credulity or vanity, the liveliness of his imagination, or the strength of his natural passions.

There is another signification of this word, to which I have frequently alluded, which speaks of the legitimate effects of the new birth, the practical and progressive change which the Holy Ghost effects in believers, by a popular and common figure, under the name of Regeneration. The word is often used in this sense by sound and orthodox divines of our Church. Maintaining in its full force the connexion between the outward sign and inward grace of Baptism, they do not adhere with strictness to the phraseology of the Liturgy, and of the ancient Christians. Some writers use the word indifferently, either for the spiritual grace of Baptism, or for that inward change which is more properly denominated renovation; or, whilst they acknowledge that the former is its strict and accurate sense, use it occasionally in a more enlarged and popular manner. Some, with greater deference to the popular use of words than to accuracy of doctrinal language, style the inward grace of the Sacrament baptismal Regeneration, and give the title of spiritual Regeneration to the progressive renewal and change of the inward frame. But this distinction has no foundation in

the language of Scripture, and does not appear altogether safe. For though the doctrinal views of these writers appear to be sound, and in unison with the sentiments of our Church, the verbal distinction which they have laid down seems to imply, what was probably far from their intention, that Regeneration in Baptism is not spiritual Regeneration. Others, again, without denying the virtue and efficacy of Baptism, use the word almost exclusively in the popular signification.

But the Arminian divines contended that what is here called the popular, is the only true and proper sense of this expression⁶. For, in their

⁶ *Regeneratio facit nos Dei filios, id est Deo similes, et, ut diximus, perficitur verbo Evangelii. Quando se componit ad vitam juxta illius præscriptum instituendam, Patris imaginem sensim exprimit: at postquam actu ipso ostendit se verbo illo regi, tum totum patrem refert, seque genuinum illius filium ostendit. Ad novum itaque effectum respicitur: modus, quo ille peragitur, phrasibus illis non continetur, sed ex aliis locis petendus est. Limborch, Theol. Christ. l. iv. c. 14. § 14.*

It is in this sense that Archbishop Tillotson uses the word, in his Sermons on the nature and necessity of Regeneration. But in his Sermons on the ordinary influences of the Holy Spirit, he decidedly states his opinion that the Holy Ghost is given in Baptism, and defends the language of our Church, in the office of Baptism for children, as agreeable to Scripture, the ancient fathers, and the Liturgies of the Reformed Churches. And no one who is acquainted with the Archbishop's sentiments, will suspect him of supposing that some infants receive the Holy

opinion, the figure relates solely to effects, without taking into the account the mode in which they are produced, or the instruments by which they are effected. We may, indeed, they tell us, learn from other passages of Scripture, that this moral and practical change is effected by the Word and Spirit of God. But it is called Regeneration only when completed; and men are not said to be regenerate in the Scriptural sense, till their whole conduct shows that they are governed by God's word, and till they resemble their heavenly Father, and show themselves to be his genuine children. Hence they positively deny that there is any connexion between Baptism and Regeneration⁷, and find fault, not

Ghost in Baptism, and others not. Sermon 200. Vol. x. p. 345, 6. Octavo edition.

⁷ Sacramenta in nobis operantur, tanquam signa repræsentantia menti nostræ rem cujus signa sunt. Neque alia in illis quæri debet efficacia. Limborch, Theol. Christ. l. iv. c. 66. § 31.

Contraremonstrantes valdè intricatè sententiam suam proponunt, nec distinctè satis concipi potest quid sibi velint. Idem, § 30.

Baptismus ritus est, quo fideles, tanquam sacrâ tesserâ, confirmantur de gratiosâ Dei erga ipsos voluntate, remissione peccatorum, ac æternâ vitâ, seque ad vitæ emendationem, et præceptorum obedientiam obstringunt. C. 67. § 5.

Baptismum non esse lavacrum regenerationis satis ex iis, quæ antea de sacramentorum efficacîâ disputavimus, constare potest. C. 67. § 10.

Contraremonstrantes affirmare non audent omnes fidelium

without reason, with their Calvinistic opponents, who pretended to maintain this connexion by the help of verbal ambiguities and ingenious equivocations, while they virtually denied it in the whole tenour of their doctrines and peculiar opinions.

But here again, though their arguments are sound and reasonable, supposing their definition to be correct, the theory of Regeneration is mis-stated, and the popular sense of the word substituted for its strict and appropriate meaning: the efficacy which the Church has assigned to the right use of its Sacraments is enervated; and the language of Scripture itself is frequently subjected to such

liberos fœdere divino comprehendî, et per Baptismum fœderis divini sigillo obsignari, sed solos electos. Hinc affirmare non dubitant, infantes fidelium baptizatos, si progressu ætatis impiâ ac profanâ vitâ suâ ostendant, se non habere Spiritum regenerationis, eum non amisisse, sed nunquam habuisse: baptizari autem, quia ex judicio charitatis pro fœderatis habendi sunt. Quâ suâ doctrinâ reverâ necessitatem Pædo-baptismi evertunt, utpote qui fallax tantum fœderis divini signum sit. Quodque gravius est, doctrina hæc cum maximâ Dei injuriâ conjuncta est. Quia enim Baptismus, ut fœderis divini sigillum, solemniter administratur in nomen Patris, Filii, et Spiritus Sancti, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus invocantur tanquam testes in testimonium, quod dubium, incertum, ac fallax est, multorumque respectu falsum. Hinc Zanchius, ut incommodum illud vitet, consentaneè doctrinæ suæ docuit, Baptismum non esse administrandum, nisi sub hâc conditione, *si electi sint*: neminemque baptizandum, nisi hâc particulâ vel expressâ vel subintellectâ, *Ego, O Deus, hunc baptizo secundum electionem et propositum divinæ voluntatis tuæ*. C. 68. § 14.

modes of interpretation as are disclaimed by a sound and judicious criticism. In these subjects, whilst we keep close to the established theory and doctrine of the Church, one passage of Scripture throws light upon another; and where different texts appear to disagree, they may be reconciled upon general and approved rules of interpretation. But error is manifold, and every error has its difficulties to encounter, and its solutions to propound. The view which our Church takes of Regeneration in Baptism is in accordance with sound sense and experience, with just ideas of the reasonable faculties and moral nature of man, with the general truth of religion, and the particular theory of Christianity. But every departure from it is more or less at variance with one or other of these principles, and, consequently, with the true sense and sound interpretation of Scripture itself.

It will be needless to inquire farther into all the variations from the truth which have been detailed in this Chapter. But in the following Chapter I shall examine more at length the grounds of that theory which has been opposed with the greatest confidence to the doctrine maintained in this Treatise. If it is founded in reason and Scripture, we must retrace our steps, and endeavour to discover the weak points of our own theory. If it is built upon scholastic para-

doxes, or exaggerated views of any part of Christian truth, we may be contented to tread the highway which our Church has pointed out to us, and our ancestors in the faith have trodden, without turning aside to the right hand or the left.

CHAPTER X.

AN EXAMINATION OF THE CALVINISTIC THEORY OF
REGENERATION.

WE have seen that according to the theory stated in a preceding Chapter, Regeneration is a pure act of God's special grace, immanent in himself and terminating in man, limited and determined to a particular time, and not admitting latitude and increase. But the theory, whose merits we now propose to examine, proceeds upon totally different principles. For it represents Regeneration as a kind of general revolution in the moral nature and reasonable faculties of man, effected by the sole power of God's Holy Spirit, in the way of creation or miraculous operation; as an implantation of new qualities or habits; or as that turning point from evil to good, in which a radical change of all the parts and faculties of the soul takes place. Such

a change, however confidently asserted and ingeniously defended, will be found, if I mistake not, on a more exact inquiry, to be inconsistent with the reason of the thing, the experience and history of mankind, and the drift and purposes of natural and revealed religion.

That those changes which have their seat in our intellectual and moral nature, so far as they are effected through the medium of religious instruction and exercises, are the joint work of the Holy Spirit and of that principle of self-action which God has implanted in man, is a truth to which Scripture and our own reason and conscience bear a concurrent and consistent testimony. We learn from Scripture that the aid of the Holy Ghost is requisite to the illumination of our understandings, and the renewal and reformation of our hearts. But, at the same time, it presses upon us the necessity of intellectual and moral discipline, and exhorts us to do for ourselves, in our own place and proportion, the very same things of which it speaks in other passages as the work of God and the Holy Ghost. Reason and conscience likewise teach us, with an evidence which cannot be contradicted, that according to the common tenour of God's dispensations, no *sensible* change takes place in the dispositions and habits of the mind without our own active co-operation. Whether, therefore, we refer ourselves to the word of God, or follow the track

which reason and conscience mark out to us, there is no cause for supposing that the Holy Ghost, when He is carrying on the work of enlightening and reforming the human soul, acts otherwise than in the order of intellectual and moral causes, accommodating his influences to the intellect and moral nature of free and accountable agents, not creating new qualities, nor implanting new faculties, but working upon materials which, though deranged and disordered by the fall, and impaired by our own sins, are nevertheless inherent in our constitution.

It is true that these changes take place in various ways, and differ materially in times and seasons, degrees and measures; but they present no appearances inconsistent with the usual relation between causes and effects. The same varieties occur in the operation of moral and intellectual causes, where the special agency of the Spirit is confessedly excluded. For though the changes effected by those causes are usually gradual and imperceptible, yet it frequently happens that the powers of the mind and the moral principles are strongly developed at particular seasons, and that important changes, so far as they come within the cognizance of our conscience and memory, may be traced back with great probability to particular occasions. These are matters of frequent occurrence, and are not thought to be miraculous; and it is natural to

suppose, that the causes which have led to these striking developments have been working their way in silence, and combining and preparing their effects. But there is no reason to think that those changes which are brought about by spiritual causes, and the supernatural and remedial power¹ of the Holy Ghost, are effected in another manner, or that they are to be referred to the class of miracles or literal creations. Indeed, such a supposition appears inconsistent with the freedom and responsibility of man, and seems to resolve religious improvement into necessity and fatalism.

But this theory, which contemplates Regeneration as an implantation of habits, or a mystical and miraculous change of all the parts and faculties of the soul, rests on a metaphysical notion, that the change which the Holy Spirit produces in the inward frame of man must commence in all its parts, at some turning point, or precise and definite moment. To analyze the workings of the Holy Spirit, and assign to Him a particular time and measure of action, appears, at first sight, an imprudent and hopeless undertaking. But if this

¹ We cannot either will or do without God's help : He worketh both in us ; that is, we by his help alone are enabled to do things above our nature. But then we are the persons enabled : and therefore we do these works as we do others, not by the same powers, but in the same manner. Bp. Taylor, U. N. p. 675.

change is, as we learn from Scripture, the joint produce of divine and human, of spiritual and moral causes, and is, therefore, brought about not in the order of miraculous but of moral effects, the hypothesis is unfounded, and the metaphysical data on which it rests are necessarily erroneous.

Our acquaintance with the operation of moral causes is altogether practical and experimental, and no arguments can be valid and conclusive which are not borne out by an induction of facts and the history of human nature. But uniform experience contradicts the theory which we are examining. For it proves that we have such faculties and principles in our nature as we might expect to find in the frame and constitution of religious and responsible creatures; that they must be brought into action by instruction and moral discipline; and that habits of holiness and spiritual discernment are not infused into us, but are formed and matured in the same manner as our other moral and intellectual endowments. The same imperceptible transition from evil to good, the same fusion and absorption of habits, the same process of causes operating in silence, and elements of reformation working their way, till they acquire, we know not how, some shape and consistency, characterize those changes which are purely moral, and those which are, properly speaking, religious and spiritual. The reason is obvious. For this is the only method of spiritual

and supernatural agency which will allow man to work out his own improvement and salvation, as a free and voluntary agent. The Holy Spirit, therefore, is not bestowed on him ² to give new properties to his soul, nor to supersede his own faculties and endeavours, but to excite, encourage, and strengthen them, to prevent and correct his will, and to give a right turn and bias to his affections. It is, indeed, generally allowed that evil is not extinguished at any turning point or decisive period, nor mastered by violent and miraculous remedies, but must be encountered and subdued by moral and religious discipline. Nor does analogy or experience justify us in supposing that good principles are developed, or good habits formed in any other manner ³.

² It has been a subject of dispute, whether the grace of the Holy Spirit is moral suasion or power. The truth seems to be, that it is both. Preventing grace is that influence which the Holy Ghost exercises upon the soul, in turning it from evil, giving a right bias to the will and affections, and bringing into play the good principles of our nature; and this change must be wrought through the medium of moral instruments. Co-operating grace is that power of the Holy Spirit superadded to our natural faculties, which enables us to do those things, to which the will, when prevented and rectified, prompts and determines us, and to form our good principles into habits by use and exercise.

Preventing grace requires on man's part consent, or the yielding himself to the influence of reasonable evidences and moral arguments and persuasions; co-operating grace, the active exertion and diligent use of those faculties with which God has endowed him.

³ It has been already stated, that the grace conferred by Baptism

But if this theory of Regeneration is inconsistent with the reason of the thing and the history and experience of our nature, it is no less inconsistent with the genius and purposes of natural and revealed religion. For religion, whether natural or revealed, is a moral instrument of improvement and salvation, requiring a moral subject, acting by moral means, tending to a moral end, and producing moral effects. By natural religion, I mean, without any reference to the source from whence we derive our knowledge, those first truths and principles of religion which are addressed to the plain sense and reason of mankind, and when fairly stated and deliberately examined, carry with them the assent of the understanding and conscience. Such are those truths which relate to the difference between good and evil, the nature and will of God, and the duties and responsibility of man. By revealed religion, I mean those truths which are addressed principally to our faith, and depend upon testimony; those especially which are of a remedial nature, and are connected with the fall and recovery of the human soul.

It is evident, at first sight, that the moral and intellectual improvement of mankind is the end of natural religion, and that it operates by moral means,

is a potential principle or latent power, which must be developed by the right use of the means of grace, and by moral and religious discipline.

and in a moral manner. Nor can there be any reasonable doubt that revealed and remedial religion operates in the same way, and in the same order of causes. It furnishes new sanctions to God's will and man's duty, and new motives to exertion and improvement. It gives spring and elasticity to the soul, by relieving it from the weight of guilt and the fear of punishment; and it engages to supply it with spiritual and supernatural assistance in framing and perfecting its moral habits, and working out its own salvation. But it does not supersede the obligations of natural religion, nor destroy the established relation between moral and religious causes and effects. For though revelation gives a new turn and a supernatural impulse to moral instruments, such as example, instruction, prayer, study, and meditation, it produces no effects in the ordinary and settled course of God's dispensations, without their intervention.

But the theory which we are examining assumes an entire change in all the parts and faculties of the soul as a first step to religious improvement; it supposes that habits of belief and holiness are not formed by moral means and discipline, but implanted in the soul by a literal creation, or miraculous action of the divine power; that previous to this change man is utterly incapable of any spiritual exertion, or any movement of the soul to God and holiness; that this revolution of the inward frame

takes place at some turning point, or at least within some particular compass of time; and consequently, that habitual godliness is not the moral and legitimate, but the necessary consequence of Regeneration. In short, it substitutes a scheme of necessity for that system of intellectual and moral discipline in which all the parts and branches of religion, whether natural or revealed, whether addressed to our faith or our reason, uniformly centre.

But the metaphysical paradoxes of this system depend on some particular views of the doctrine of the fall, and the original and inbred depravity of our common nature. Though the doctrine of original sin is plainly deducible from Scripture, it is a subject on which it touches with a moderate and sparing hand; and it certainly does not warrant the exaggerated descriptions of our natural and necessary condition as fallen creatures, which are to be found in the writings of Divines, and in some popular systems of theology. Scripture uniformly speaks of the sinfulness of man in a practical and experimental manner. It lays before us a series of observations arising out of particular facts and occasions, or out of a general view of the conduct and character of that portion of mankind with which the inspired writers were conversant. But besides the conclusions which are deducible from Scripture by means of analysis and induction, and the brief but pointed account of the fall recorded in the book of

Genesis, there is one passage of St. Paul's Epistles ⁴ in which the origin of evil is referred back in express terms to Adam's transgression, and the prevalence and universality of sin are accounted for upon the principles of an hereditary infection. Man is there considered as lying under a sentence of condemnation, and tainted with moral evil, in consequence of the guilt of our first parent. The Apostle speaks of this doctrine as an acknowledged truth, and infers, in the way of analogy, the universality of our recovery and redemption in Christ from the universality of our fall and condemnation in Adam, as a principle which he might safely assume for a medium of comparison and illustration. But he does not tell us what is the precise nature of that condemnation which has been brought upon us by the fall, independently of our own personal sins; nor does he attempt to define the extent and virulence of that infection of nature which has been entailed upon us by descent and derivation.

The ancient Christians handled the fall of man with the same reserve and moderation, treating this original infection of his nature not as a speculative but a practical doctrine, and resolving that state of condemnation, in which he is placed previously to his call, election, and Regeneration, into the just but incomprehensible judgment of God. Calvin indeed

⁴ Rom. v. 12, &c.

finds ⁵ fault with them for not delivering their opinion on this subject with sufficient decision and perspicuity. But they acted soberly and wisely, for they acknowledged the fact, but did not attempt to explain it systematically, or to define the nature of the evil with precision, because they knew that such an attempt was not warranted by Scripture.

But the theologians, whose theory we are now canvassing, have pronounced their judgment upon this question in a tone of dogmatism, to which neither Scripture nor experience give any sanction, and have painted out the nature and character of original sin, and the necessary and universal conse-

⁵ Postquam in Adâ *obliterata fuit cœlestis imago*, non solus sustinuit hanc pœnam, ut in locum sapientiæ, virtutis, sanctitatis, veritatis, justitiæ, teterrimæ succederent pestes, cæcitas, impatientia, impuritas, vanitas, injustitia: sed iisdem quoque miseriis implicuit suam progeniem ac immersit. Hæc est hæreditaria corruptio, quam peccatum originale veteres nuncupârunt, peccati voce intelligentes naturæ antea bonæ puræque depravationem. Quâ de re multa fuit illis concertatio, quum a communi sensu nihil magis sit remotum, quàm ob unius culpam fieri omnes reos, et ita peccatum fieri commune. Quæ videtur ratio fuisse vetustissimis Ecclesiæ doctoribus, cur obscurè tantùm perstringerent hoc caput, saltem minus dilucidè quàm par erat, explicarent. Calv. Inst. l. ii. c. 1. s. 5.

What their doctrine on this head was, may be learned from Wall's Infant Baptism. It is most certain that they uniformly acknowledged this truth, and grounded upon it the necessity of redemption and Regeneration in Baptism. See likewise Bp. Tomline on the 9th Article. Elements, vol. ii. p. 235.

quences of the fall, in aggravated colours⁶. According to their system, the immediate consequence of the fall was the obliteration of God's image from the soul of man. Hence he became an unmixed mass of depravity and corruption, without one spark or remnant of goodness; necessarily determined to evil in every choice and action, cankered and rotten to the very core, utterly averse from God, and reduced to a state of confusion, disorder, rebellion, blindness, and impotency, without one

⁶ Quicquid ingenium nostrum concipit, agit, instituit, molitur, semper malum est.

Ita ex omni parte vitiata corruptaque est voluntas, ut nihil nisi malum generet—Anima non ex vitiis modo laborat, sed omni bono prorsus vacua est—Non dicit (Joh. xv. 1.) nos esse infirmiores, quàm qui nobis sufficiamus; sed nos ad nihilum redigendo omnem vel exiguæ facultatulæ opinionem excludit. Inst. l. ii. c. 3. s. 9.

Stet ergo nobis indubia illa veritas, quæ nullis machinamentis quatefieri potest. Mentem hominis sic alienatam prorsus a Dei justitiâ, ut nihil non impium, contortum, fœdum, impurum, flagitiosum concipiat: cor peccati veneno ita penitus delibutum esse, ut nihil quàm corruptum fœtorem efflare queat. Quod si quippiam interdum boni in speciem ostendat, mentem tamen semper hypocrisi et fallaci obliquitate involutam, animum interiore perversitate illigatum manere. c. 5. s. 19.

The image of God was blotted out, so that man is no longer a free agent: hence his unregenerate state is a state of mere confusion, disorder, rebellion, blindness, impotency, and aversion from God—Not so much as one good thought could ever yet escape to heaven free from it. Bp. Hopkins, vol. ii. p. 479.

redeeming principle, or counteracting tendency. Such, they tell us, is the extent of this depravity, that even an infant is necessarily odious and abominable in God's sight, because he contains within him the seeds and principles of every kind of wickedness⁷.

Sometimes they attempt to account for this depravity, and for the sentence of condemnation which has passed upon fallen man, by borrowing from the schoolmen a fabulous account of a certain compact between God and Adam, in which he was supposed to covenant for all his descendants, and to bind them down to the consequences of his own conduct, as their federal head and representative. Hence, we are told, the sin of Adam became legally and forensically their own sin, and they were, on principles of justice and natural equity, as deep in the transgression as Adam himself, and as liable to the pains and penalties denounced against it⁸.

⁷ *Tota eorum (infantium) natura quoddam est peccati semen : ideò non odiosa et abominabilis Deo esse non potest. l. ii. c. 1. s. 18.*

⁸ This history of imputation was proposed to the Council of Trent by Catharin, one of the most eminent of the schoolmen of those days, as a solution of the doctrine of original sin. It afterwards became a fashionable doctrine among the scholastic Calvinists. Dr. S. Ward has a treatise on the subject, in which his arguments are avowedly borrowed from the writings of Catharin*. The same scheme of imputation was maintained by

* *Prælectiones de peccato originali, c. 13 & 14.*

Sometimes they account for this utter corruption of our nature on principles of philosophical analysis. Man, they tell us, by transgressing the divine law, became liable to punishment: hence, he contracted a deep enmity against God, as the avenger of sin, and, in consequence, became hostile to the very principle of holiness, and tainted to the core with moral and spiritual corruption. They teach us, with a great show of metaphysical precision, in what way the intellect, the will, and the affections of fallen man are darkened, distorted, and polluted, by the action of the intellect upon the will, and of the will upon the affections. In this state of utter depravity, natural antipathy to holiness, and deep-rooted hatred of God Himself, he cannot be restored by the ordinary operation of spiritual remedies and moral discipline, but must undergo an entire change of all the parts and faculties of the soul, before he can experience any desire of improvement, or any movement of the soul to God. For if the image of God is obliterated in man, if his understanding is entirely darkened, his will altogether perverse, and incapable of choosing any thing but sin; if his affections are totally depraved, if there is no spark or relic of good in his

Bishop Davenant on the authority of the schoolmen, (Preface to Whitby on the five Points,) and is stated with perfect confidence as evangelical doctrine by Bishop Hopkins in his Sermons, which he entitles "The Doctrine of the Two Covenants."

whole inward frame⁹, if he is a mere compound of beast and devil, if he is actuated by a real and literal hatred of God, and a fierce aversion to his holy law, man cannot be restored to his favour, nor to any capacity for holiness, without a new creation, in the strict sense of the word, and a miraculous infusion of new faculties and habits.

Regeneration, therefore, is described as that turning point and broad line of demarcation, which separates two essentially different and diametrically opposite states of mind; and is said to consist in a radical change of the parts and faculties of the soul, and an implantation of a habit of grace and holiness.

Such are the theological principles on which this theory of Regeneration is founded; and I would ask, what warrant we have in Scripture or experience for these aggravated descriptions of human depravity, considered as the natural and direct consequence of the fall? or upon what basis of Scriptural truth and simplicity either that history of imputation, or that philosophical scheme and analysis of original sin, have been constructed? It is a dangerous thing to attempt to improve upon Scripture, to venture upon hypotheses, and indulge ourselves in

⁹ From that time every man who is born into the world, bears the image of the devil in pride and self-will—the image of the beast in sensual appetites and desires.—John Wesley. Southey's *Life of Wesley*, vol. ii. p. 169.

philosophical systems and speculations, where Scripture confines itself to practical observations, and instructs us in the way of induction.

This theory confounds in one coarse and undistinguishing picture all the various degrees of wickedness which the history of mankind exhibits to us, and assumes the most corrupt and degraded state of intellect and morals, of which man is capable, as the standard and pattern of our fallen nature. Man, indeed, since the fall, is "very far gone from original righteousness," and has contracted a strong bias to evil in his will and affections, and a visible tendency to decay both in intellect and morals. But the most degenerate condition of the most ignorant and most profligate of his kind is not his natural state, nor the immediate and universal consequence of the fall. In the midst of his debasement and inherent bias to evil, he inherits many relics of his better self, principles of moral goodness, and distinct lineaments of that image of God in which he was created; and, whatever his practice may be, the judgments of his understanding, and the decisions of his conscience are usually on the side of virtue and morality, unless his intellect has been degraded by ignorance and bad education, or his conscience seared by habits of profligacy, and an universal corruption of manners.

Nothing is more evident to common sense than the progress and increase of vicious habits in indivi-

duals. So far as fallen man is acquainted with his duty, St. Paul's personification of his own countrymen, or perhaps of the natural man, whether Jew or Greek ¹, describes the contest which exists within him in an early stage of his sinful courses, between concupiscence and evil affections, and the dictates of reason and conscience ². But habits of sin, unless

¹ Or, as Barrow says, "He speaketh in the person of a man endowed with natural strength, abstracting from the subsidiary virtue and operation of the Holy Ghost." In fact, what St. Paul is led by the tenour of his argument to say of the Jews in particular, applies by analogy to all persons who are in the same or similar circumstances.

² Romans vii. 7—25. It has been contended that St. Paul in this passage is speaking in his own person as a servant and apostle of Christ, or to use a popular expression, as a *truly regenerate man*.

This view of the passage, which is contrary to the main current of ancient opinion, is not the result of investigation, analysis, comparison, or any received ground and principle of interpretation; but is built on a conceit, that the man who is not living under the influence of the grace of Christ, necessarily hates the law of God, and the principle of holiness, and therefore cannot *will* what is good, nor *delight in*, that is, approve and admire, his law.

It is totally irrelevant to the Apostle's argument, and interrupts the thread and context of his discourse.

It is inconsistent with one main end and design of the Gospel: which is, to deliver men from the dominion of sin, and to enable them not only to *will* but to *do* what is good; not only to *delight in*, or to approve, *the law of God*, but to *delight to do his will*.

It is in opposition to the whole tenour of the New Testament, to the drift of the Apostle's arguments and reasonings in this

counteracted by sound instruction and moral discipline, gain ground upon him, till he abandons himself to them without constraint or reluctance, keeps out of sight all obligations to duty, and silences the warnings and visitations of conscience. And experience teaches us that the corruption of public morals, and the increasing degeneracy of our common nature, proceed onward in the same order and analogy. Hence, those passages of Scripture which describe in glowing colours the lamentable ignorance, the idolatrous habits, and the corrupt morals of the heathen world, or the degenerate state of the inspired writers' countrymen and contemporaries, and are pictures of the increase and predominance of evil, and of the worst men in the worst times, must not be construed into descriptions of human nature in the abstract, or, to use a common phrase, of *unregenerate* man. For we are no more justified in forming our estimate of human nature from the principles and characters of the most abandoned of our fellow-creatures, than in forming our estimate of the general condition of believers in Christ from what we hear and see of the holiest and best of God's servants.

Epistle, and to the scope of the controversy in which he is engaged.

It is not merely irrelevant to, but overthrows and destroys the course of argument, exhortation, caution, and encouragement which St. Paul is pursuing in the 6th, 7th, and 8th chapters of this Epistle.

History, indeed, teaches us that the ignorance and moral corruption of the heathens were most deplorable: and St. Paul accounts for the sad state of the great mass of mankind from the natural progress of evil habits, considered not merely as the effect of the fall, but as the judicial consequence of idolatry and apostacy from the primitive and patriarchal religion. But even here there are some bright spots and examples of better principles and morals, sufficient to refute an hypothesis which confounds all degrees and varieties of evil, and expunges from the soul, by one sweeping sentence, every tendency to good, and every lineament of its original resemblance to God.

In fact, there are few of those good dispositions which, when nurtured by the grace of God, and formed into habits by religious instruction and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, are justly denominated spiritual accomplishments, of which we do not discover some imperfect traces in the history of the heathen world. It is easy to assert that all their virtues were sins, and equally damnable with their worst vices. Many of what they deemed virtues were in reality sins; their virtues were at the best exceedingly imperfect, and fell far short of the Christian standard; and they could have no value in God's sight, nor any claim to an everlasting reward. Still, as far as they proceeded on right principles, and aimed at good ends, and especially

when they had an obscure reference to the will of a sovereign and supreme Being, they were, properly speaking, virtues, and plain indications of the purposes of our creation, and of the original fashion and tendencies of our nature. St. Paul, therefore, justly argues, that *when the Gentiles which have not the law do by nature the things of the law, these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves, which show the work of the law written in their hearts* ³: and seems to intimate that some of their number may have attained to peace and glory through God's great goodness and uncovenanted mercy. *Glory, honour, and peace to every man that worketh good, to the Jew first, and also to the Gentile: for there is no respect of persons with God* ⁴.

It is almost needless to examine that metaphysical system, which ascribes the taint and corruption of human nature to man's hostility to the principle of holiness, and then attributes this hostility to his inveterate hatred of God, as the avenger of sin; or that account of original sin, which refers back the corruption of the affections to the perverseness of the will, and the perverseness of the will to the absolute darkness and distortion of the intellect. For these notions have no colour of Scriptural authority, and are not borne out by the history and experience of human nature. Man, indeed, when his

³ Rom. ii. 14, 15.

⁴ Rom. ii. 10.

conscience upbraids him with his sins, endeavours to silence its reproaches, and withdraws his mind, as much as possible, from the thought of God, and from the fear of the consequences; but he does not naturally hate God as the avenger of sin. His habits are too often directly opposed to the principle of holiness, in consequence of the corrupt state of his affections; but he is not naturally hostile to the principle of holiness itself.

In the system of which I am speaking there are no paradoxes more common, and at the same time less conformable to the fact, or to the truth of Scripture, than that man naturally hates God, and has a fierce antipathy to his laws, or rather to the very principle of holiness. If by hating God we mean, according to the Scriptural phraseology, not loving Him as we ought, and preferring our own passions and devices to his will and wisdom, in this sense man, in his natural state, before the grace of Christ, and the inspiration of the Holy Ghost, may be said, with great propriety, to hate God, and his whole history bears witness to the truth of this Scriptural lesson. Nor is it less true that man has an antipathy to God's laws, if by antipathy we mean an inherent unwillingness to attend to them and obey them, and a dislike to their restraints and provisions. But the theory before us speaks of "fierce antipathies" and "inveterate hatred," and represents man as hating God, and resisting his will, on

principle and system : not as disliking and fretting against the restraints which are imposed upon his sensual and selfish desires, but as actuated by a determined animosity to those principles of holiness, to which God's laws are conformed : as hating God because he is God ; and goodness in the abstract, because it is goodness ; and loving evil for evil's sake.

But the truth is, that if man ever does positively hate God, and the principles on which his laws are grounded, this state of mind is so far from being natural, that it can only be the effect of great degeneracy, of deplorable and brutal ignorance, or of confirmed habits of wickedness and impiety. The history of our nature furnishes us with ample proofs of our weakness and vanity, our low views, our supineness and self-sufficiency, and our dislike of serious exercises and self-inquiry ; of the perverseness of our wills, and the corrupt state of our affections ; of our proneness to evil, and unwillingness to submit to wholesome restraints and moral discipline. But it does not bear us out in affirming that the natural man is actuated by a settled hatred of God, or a fierce antipathy to holiness. We shall therefore speak more consistently with the fact, if we allow that the corruption of human nature, when aggravated by habits of sin, leads men by degrees to an hostility to the principle of holiness, and that this hostility to the principle of holiness may, in

extreme cases, end in a direct hatred of God Himself; and if we affirm, generally speaking, that the passions and will of fallen man, instead of being misled by the intellect, impair the faculties, darken the vision, and pervert the judgments of his understanding.

Some of those divines, who ground the necessity of such a change, as this theory of Regeneration exhibits, on these views of the depravity of human nature, allow, nevertheless, that there may be, comparatively speaking, different degrees of moral goodness in *unregenerate* men; but they contend that they are all equally deficient in spiritual goodness. If it is meant that man cannot of himself attain to those kinds and degrees of goodness which must, upon Scriptural principles, be wrought in him by the power and inspiration of the Holy Ghost, this is a truism which no one will attempt to controvert. For all parties to this debate confess, with our Church, that "the condition of man after the fall is such, that he cannot turn and prepare himself, by his own natural strength and good works, to faith and calling upon God: and that, therefore, we can have no power to do *good works, pleasant and acceptable to God*, without the grace of God by Christ preventing us that we may have a good will, and working with us when we have that good will ^a."

^a Article X.

But there seems to be some confusion in the notion which these divines entertain of the difference between spiritual and moral habits and actions⁶. For this difference does not consist in the order and nature of the things themselves, the manner of acting, or the faculties of the agent, but in the law or rule to which they are conformed, in their efficient and instrumental, and in their final causes. Moral habits and actions, though they have not that perfection which can render them pleasing and acceptable to God, and are not necessarily conformed to his declared will, but to the rules of right reason and experimental wisdom, are, nevertheless, so far as they go, good in themselves, because they are conformed to a moral law, (and every moral law is, in a certain sense, an express of God's will,) and imply a right choice and a voluntary principle of action. But if there are still some good principles and remains of moral goodness in man's constitution, though they require religious discipline and instruction, and the preventing and co-operating power of the Holy Ghost, to bring them into play and mould them into spiritual habits, they plainly contradict the more exaggerated representations of man's natural

⁶ Spiritual goodness is, in fact, the perfection and improvement of moral goodness wrought in the human soul by the help and instrumentality of the Holy Ghost, having God's will for its rule, and God's glory and the happiness of a life to come for its end.

depravity, and remove the necessity of such a change as this theory designates by the word Regeneration—a creation of new faculties and habits, and a miraculous transformation of the whole inward frame.

We are told, however, that the broad and decisive distinction laid down in Scripture between nature and grace, and between natural and spiritual men, necessarily implies and involves this spiritual change. The distinction between nature and grace appears to be a scholastic rather than a Scriptural distinction, and is, I apprehend, somewhat inaccurate. For the true distinction does not seem to lie between nature and grace, but between nature left to its own bias and counsels, and nature reformed and invigorated by God's Word and Spirit. But the Scriptural distinction between spiritual and natural'

' 1 Cor. ii. 14. *Ψυχικός*. The word *πνευματικός*, in this passage of Scripture, is equivalent to *τέλειος*, and signifies a Christian well advanced in the knowledge and practice of his religion, and is not only opposed to unbelievers, whom St. Paul calls here, by a comparative and degrading expression, *ψυχικούς*, but to Christian novices, or babes, whose schismatical conduct showed that they had made small progress in religious knowledge and practice, and whom he calls, by a similar figure, *σαρκικούς*.

Ψυχὴ properly signifies the animal principle opposed to *νοῦς*, or the reasonable principle—the *ἐπιθυμητικόν* to the *ἡγεμονικόν*. But St. Paul considers the unbeliever, who had not received the Spirit of God, as no better than *ψυχικός*—a mere animal man; and then contemplates the weak, imperfect Christian, who was

(animal or carnal) men is altogether practical. For it does not imply any precise instant in which the understanding is enlightened, the will reformed, and the affections purified, but points out the real and practical difference between believers and unbelievers, between those men who had been instructed by the Gospel and enlightened and purified by the Spirit of Christ, and those men who were following the bent of their natural passions and propensities, or, at the best, had no better guides than their unassisted reason, or the wisdom of the schools and the philosophers. It is easy to bring together passages of Scripture which describe in strong and glowing figures the lamentable state of the unconverted Gentiles, and the happy change which had taken place in the converts to the Gospel, and by the help of rhetorical colouring and comments to make them bear upon an opinion to which they have, in fact, no relation. But I am persuaded that Scripture, explained on just and legitimate principles, gives no countenance to this theory.

not walking after the Spirit, as no better than *σαρκικός*, still walking after the flesh, the natural or animal principle of action. But he calls these converts carnal, not in the strictest sense, as men utterly devoid of the Spirit of grace, (for he afterwards speaks of them as temples of the Holy Ghost,) but in the way of comparison and reproof, on account of their intestine divisions, and the small progress which they had made in spiritual knowledge and habits.

It has been contended, likewise, that man, being, subsequently to the fall, spiritually dead, cannot perform any spiritual acts whatever till he is spiritually regenerated. This argument is put forward in various forms. Sometimes we find it stated in the shape of a dilemma; sometimes as a postulate, which no reasonable man can call in question. For it is contended, that as no natural acts can be performed previous to the natural birth, so, on principles of analogy, no spiritual acts can be performed previous to the spiritual birth. Upon this ground it is affirmed, that every adult recipient who is duly qualified for Baptism, must necessarily be regenerated before the Sacrament, because no man can believe, or repent, or perform any other spiritual acts, till he has been born again. Thus, St. Paul was regenerated before his Baptism⁸, because he

⁸ This notion that St. Paul was regenerated before Baptism, though directly opposite to the plain sense of Scripture, has been strenuously maintained by Calvin and his followers, and urged as an example to prove that all believers are regenerate before Baptism.

Jam erant dimissa Paulo peccata : non igitur baptismo demùm ablutus est, sed novam gratiæ quam adeptus est confirmationem accepit. Calvin ad Act. xxii. 16.

Dicimur accipere, obtinere, impetrare, quod quantum ad fidei nostræ sensum nobis a Domino exhibetur; sive id tum primum testatur, sive testatum magis ac certius confirmat. Hoc itaque tantum voluit Ananias. Ut certus sis, Paule, remissa tibi esse peccata, baptizare. Promittit enim Dominus in Baptismo remis-

prayed, and his prayer was accepted; Cornelius, because he was a devout man and feared God, and his *prayers and alms had gone up for a memorial before God*. But we cannot argue from the literal to the metaphorical use of a word, any farther than the point of comparison extends. Hence this analogical argument is, to place it in the most favourable point of view, evidently inconclusive, because it assumes the very question in debate—*what is the point of comparison in which the resemblance between the natural and spiritual, or, in other words, between the literal and metaphorical birth consists?* But, according to the established theory of the Church, grounded, as I apprehend, on plain and unexceptionable Scriptural authority, this point of compari-

sionem peccatorum, hanc accipe et securus esto.—Calvin, Inst. l. iv. c. 15. § 15.

Dr. Ward, speaking of the passages of Scripture to which Calvin and his followers gave this turn, (Acts ii. 38; xxii. 16; Mark xvi. 16,) says, *Quid ante baptismum Deus fecerat arcanâ suâ voluntate pro talibus baptizandis Apostoli nec judicare, nec præsumere potuerunt; sed in ipso baptismo dari remissionem, ac fieri ablutionem peccatorum virtute sanguinis Christi omnibus in Christum credentibus, et præsumsisse et docuisse videntur Apostoli. Atque hâc spe nixi ad Baptismum accedebant Christiani, atque in hunc sensum veteres hæc loca intellexerunt.* Diss. p. 108.

This is the plain sense of Scripture; and there can be no doubt that such was not only the phraseology and apparent doctrine, but the firm belief and feeling of the ancient Christians. See Archbishop Laurence, part ii. p. 72, 73.

son is the passage from one state of existence to another. That passage from a state of death and condemnation in Adam to a state of life and justification in Christ, which Scripture represents as taking place in Baptism, is compared with the passage of an infant from the darkness and confinement of the womb into the light of day and freedom of motion. But according to this view of the phrase, and the doctrine which it implies, it is so far from being true that spiritual acts—such acts, I mean, as centre in God, and are performed by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost—cannot take place previous to the new birth, that in the case of adult converts spiritual acts must necessarily precede Regeneration.

If by spiritual acts we mean such habits and actions as are pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and have the promise of the life to come, according to the tenour of the Christian covenant, such acts, speaking in general terms, cannot be performed previously to Regeneration. For the Scriptures teach us that no man is released from his sins and reconciled to God till he is grafted into Christ, and, consequently, that no acts can be considered as Christian acts, or acts of covenanted holiness, till this change of spiritual condition has taken place. But our Church very properly concludes from the same Scriptures, that this change takes place in Baptism; that “a death to sin and

a new birth to righteousness is the inward and spiritual grace of this sacrament;" and that we who "are by nature born in sin and the children of wrath, are hereby made children of grace"—or, in other words, "members of Christ, children of God, and inheritors of the kingdom of heaven."

Having now examined at some length the theory which has been opposed with the greatest confidence to that doctrine of baptismal Regeneration, which has been explained and defended in this Treatise, I will leave it to the judgment of the reader, whether it is more consistent with reason, experience, and Scripture, than the theory universally maintained by the ancient Christians, and adopted by our own Church. But this theory, connected as it is with aggravated notions of the depravity of our common nature, and systematic and metaphysical views of the effect of the fall, is encumbered with some difficulties and leads to some consequences, to which it will be necessary to advert.

CHAPTER XI.

A REVIEW OF SOME DIFFICULTIES WITH WHICH THE THEORY OF REGENERATION, EXAMINED IN THE PRECEDING CHAPTER, IS ENCUMBERED, AND OF SOME CONSEQUENCES WHICH IT INVOLVES.

WE have seen that the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, in its simplest and most unsophisticated form, was universally received in the Catholic and Apostolical Churches, till it was altered and undermined, and either virtually annihilated, or openly expunged from the list of orthodox doctrines, in deference to that scheme of necessity, which superadded the doctrine of the indefectibility of true grace to the system of the ancient Predestinarians. This theory of Regeneration, therefore, is an integral part of what is commonly called the Calvinistic system, and is encumbered with the difficulties to which

that system is subject, and the consequences which it involves.

Natural and revealed religion are, as has been observed, moral instruments of reformation and improvement, and are intended to promote the welfare of man, as a rational and moral agent. A religion, therefore, which considers life and death, happiness and misery, as the consequences of different moral habits; of belief and unbelief, virtue and vice, holiness and wickedness, obedience and disobedience to the will of God; is, in the very nature of the thing, probationary, and must be looked upon as a sort of touchstone to prove and try the tempers and understandings of those men, to whom it is sufficiently propounded. Such is the drift of that religious system which the Scriptures exhibit to us; and they give us no reason to think, that the remedial and supernatural branches of religion are intended to supersede or alter its original essence and constitution. Thus, the truths and promises of the Gospel are proposed to the faith of mankind. But though man cannot believe the Gospel to any saving purposes, without the grace of God preventing him and working with him, still the grace of God and the power of the Holy Ghost suppose an honest and ingenuous use of his own faculties, and a disposition to assent to the truths and rely upon the promises, when he has sufficient evidence that they proceed from God. Thus the

Gospel presses upon him the necessity of moral improvement and obedience to God's will. But though it supplies him with motives and encouragements to well-doing, and promises of supernatural assistance, it uniformly supposes a free choice and a principle of self-action. So that the Gospel is in truth not only the salvation, but the trial and proof of fallen man; and always supposes principles of action analogous to his trial, and the right use of faculties which he already possesses.

But the theory before us contemplates man, in his *unregenerate* state, as totally devoid of all those principles and faculties, which the religion of the Gospel requires; and then supposes that the Regeneration, without which he cannot enter into the kingdom of God, consists in the creation or infusion of new habits, or a radical change of all the parts and faculties of the soul, effected by an act of omnipotence. Thus that probationary scheme of religion which Scripture, in its plain and unsophisticated sense, inculcates, is superseded by a system of pure necessity. For in this theory, where the same word is preached, and the same sacraments are ministered, the Spirit is given or withheld, life and death, salvation and condemnation, are dealt out to the several individuals of mankind, not according to the plain terms of the charter, but according to some secret determination of the Divine counsels. The regenerate must necessarily believe and be saved.

The unregenerate (those, that is, who live and die in a state of unbelief and impenitence) are precluded from belief and salvation by a decree which cannot be infringed, and a concatenation of causes and effects which it is impossible to suspend or interrupt.

The history of ecclesiastical opinion shows that this theory is a branch of that system of necessity, which supposes that true grace and all the qualities and virtues which it implies, are in their very nature indefectible; that when man has been once justified in God's sight, he cannot fall from this state of salvation; and that the principle implanted in him in his Regeneration cannot be extinguished, but must necessarily produce the fruits of holiness. There are, however, some divines who reject the Calvinistic system of predestination and indefectible grace, and yet maintain this theory of original sin and regeneration. Their notion is, that in consequence of the state to which man is reduced by the fall, he cannot repent, or believe, or perform any acts of a spiritual kind, without first experiencing a new creation of habits, or an entire and radical change of all the parts and faculties of the soul; and, consequently, that habitual holiness, being the necessary effect, or rather the very essence, of this change, is the sole criterion of Regeneration. But they allow, that after he has been born again he is in the same condition with Adam in his state of

uprightness, and may depart from grace given, and relinquish the habits of holiness which have been planted in him.

Yet, even under this modification, this theory of Regeneration still hinges upon necessity, and excludes the voluntary agency of man from any share in believing the Gospel, and the conversion of the soul to holiness. Where the same word is preached, and the same sacrament is ministered, Regeneration is still supposed to be bestowed on some men, and withholden from others, not according to the plain sense of the promise, but upon some unknown grounds of particular selection or special favouritism. Some men believe and are saved, because they are born again. Other men do not believe and are damned, because they are not endowed with this special gift of Regeneration.

Scripture, however, speaks of the rejection of the Gospel, not as the consequence of our hereditary impotence, and the depravity of our common nature, but as the personal sin of the unbeliever; not merely as the effect of that spiritual blindness which is derived to him from Adam, and, as is contended, can only be removed by a radical change of the intellectual faculties, but of a wilful indisposition to receive the truth, and surrender himself to sufficient evidences. When our Saviour commanded his Apostles to preach the Gospel to all nations, He did not add that he who is born again shall believe,

and he who believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but only, that *he that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*: implying certainly, upon common principles of interpretation, that every one to whom the Gospel is preached, may, if he will, believe and be saved. He does not say, that he who is not regenerated, will not believe and will be damned; but simply, that *he that believeth not shall be damned*: implying that unbelief is an act of personal default, and voluntary opposition to God's testimony and Spirit.

But this theory of Regeneration is not only encumbered with the difficulties which result from the substitution of necessity for probation, as the hinge and pivot of religion; but it is built on such views of the depravity of human nature, as can scarcely be cleared from the imputation of making God, by plain and necessary consequence, the cause and author of our sins. Sober and Scriptural notions of original sin are in no respect contrary to God's justice and equity, and the analogies of his moral and providential government. That fallen man should have forfeited his favour, and be lying, in some sense or other, under a sentence of condemnation, even previous to all actual transgressions, is a doctrine which, while we content ourselves with the simplicity of the Scriptural statement, and do not attempt to explain the nature, and describe the particulars of this condemnation, contradicts no

principle of reason. That man's nature should have been tainted and enervated by the sin of his first parents, and should have contracted a bias to evil, and a tendency to decay, is what experience and analogy would obviously lead us to expect. These views of original sin are sufficient to convince us of the reasonableness and necessity of a dispensation, which ensures to us redemption from guilt and condemnation, and supernatural assistance to enable us to gain ground upon the infection of our nature, and to counteract our propensity to evil, and our tendency to decay. But it is not the natural effect of sin to wipe out at once all good from the soul, and to reduce the sinner and all his posterity from a state of purity and uprightness to a state of total corruption and unmixed depravity, of antipathy to God, and enmity to the principle of holiness. If then such a change as this did really take place at the fall, it must have been effected by an act of Omnipotence: for nothing less than an act of Almighty power could have produced at once such an universal revolution in all the faculties of the soul, and swept away from it every good principle and every lineament of its resemblance to God. But if God, by an act of sovereignty, converted all the children of Adam into a race of such corrupt and degraded beings, and rendered them incapable of any good whatever, till they are regenerated by a similar act of Omnipotence, it would seem that God

is, by plain consequence, the principal cause of all wickedness, and that man, on grounds of common sense and natural equity, is no more responsible for his sins, than a wild beast is responsible for that instinct of nature, which we sometimes call cruelty or ferocity.

Calvin indeed goes further⁹, and strenuously con-

⁹ Non dicam cum Augustino, in peccato sive in malo nihil esse positivum, sed aliud mihi principium sumo. Quæ perperam et injustè ab hominibus fiunt, eadem recta et justa esse Dei opera. De Æterna Dei Præd. p. 725.

Nec vero commentum illud recipio, Deum, quia lege solutus sit, quicquid agat reprehensione vacare. Deum enim exlegem qui facit, maximâ eum gloriæ suæ parte spoliât, quia rectitudinem ejus et justitiam sepelit. Non quod legi subjectus sit Deus, nisi quatenus ipsi sibi lex sit—Nondum tamen soluta est objectio : si Dei arbitrio geruntur omnia, nec quicquam homines, nisi eo volente et ordinante, designant, esse igitur malorum omnium authorem. Vera est illa, quæ in Scholis obtinuit, distinctio, malum poenæ, non culpæ a Deo proficisci, modò dextrè intelligatur : sed imperitè quidam, quasi verbulo uno rem de quâ agitur obruere liceret, hoc ipsum, de quo maximè ambigitur, securè prætereunt : quomodo extra culpam sit Deus in eodem opere, quod in Satanâ et reprobis tam damnat ipse, quam damnatum ab hominibus pronuntiat—Quomodo igitur a culpâ eximetur Deus, cujus Satan cum suis organis reus erit ? Nempe si inter hominum facta discrimen a consilio et fine sumetur ; ut ejus damnetur crudelitas, qui cornicum oculos configit, judicis autem laudetur virtus, qui scelesti hominis cæde manus suas sanctificat ; cur deterior erit Dei conditio, ne sua eum justitia ab hominum maleficiis separet ?—Ergo cum justâ de causâ, licet nobis ignotâ, a Domino procedant, quæ sceleratè ab hominibus maleficia perpetrantur : etiâmsi rerum omnium prima causa sit ejus

tends that God concurs positively and directly in the sins of mankind, by ordaining their commission, and influencing the will to commit them. But he endeavours to prove that, even on this supposition, God cannot be deemed the cause and author of sin. For he maintains that those actions, which are sinful in man who performs them, are not sinful in God who ordains and concurs in them, because actions are denominated sinful in respect to their

voluntas, peccati tamen esse eum Authorem nego. De Æternâ Dei Prædestinatione, p. 728.

Melancthon, and the more sober and judicious Protestants, whilst they fully believed that God's providence disposes all human events, and over-rules the counsels of the wicked, employing them as his instruments in the execution of his righteous decrees, still maintained that God does not impel man to sin by any ordination or active concurrence, but withdraws his grace from them, and permits them to follow their own counsels. But Calvin arraigns such just and moderate sentiments as barking against God, and nothing better than pride and blasphemy. *Cœlestibus oraculis sinistras ignominie notas inurere non dubitant. Cœlum sputis impetunt. Adversus hanc doctrinam rabido ore latrant. In cœlum evomunt blasphemias. Inst. l. i. c. 13.*

The position that actions are denominated good or bad, righteous or sinful, with respect to their final causes, is grossly incorrect, and the examples by which the author has attempted to illustrate it, are pretty plain proofs of its weakness. Actions, indifferent in their own nature, are rendered good or evil by their final causes—actions, which are good in themselves, are contaminated and rendered evil by a bad end—but no end, however good, can sanctify an evil action, or denominate it good, either in the actor or the adviser.

final causes, and God's end in contributing to these actions is his own glory. But surely it must be acknowledged that God is the principal cause of those actions, to which He disposes the will, and in which He positively concurs. If therefore we justly refer backward to God, as their principal cause and author, all holy desires, good counsels, and just works, without taking into the account any secondary or subordinate causes, it will be difficult to prove to the satisfaction of plain minds, that He is not the cause of man's sins, if He positively concurs in sinful actions, in order to promote his own glory by the punishment of the sinner; or if, as this theory of Regeneration implies, He has, by an act of sovereign and Almighty power, made men incapable of doing any thing but sin.

There is another consequence resulting from this theory of Regeneration, inimical to the main purposes of religious instruction and discipline. For religious instruction is intended to operate on the inward frame and moral principles of man through the medium of his conscience, by bringing home its admonitions and reproofs, its pictures of human nature, its general views and special descriptions of sin, to the heart and bosom of the individual. But it is impossible that those exaggerated representations of the depravity of our common nature, which are the props and supports of this theory, can be brought home to the conscience of the sinner. When

his evil habits are described and delineated, and the several specialities of his transgressions pointed out to him; when he is charged with an inherent proneness to sin, and an aversion from holiness and moral discipline, and on these grounds is impleaded as a sinner and a fallen creature; the appeal is made to his conscience, and he acknowledges the truth of the indictment. But when he is taught that he is a compound of beast and devil, and a mere mass of depravity and loathsome corruption, that he is utterly devoid of all good principles and affections, and entertains a fierce and bitter hatred of God, and a violent antipathy to the principle of holiness; and when the necessity of Regeneration is placed upon this footing, his conscience cannot acquiesce in these charges, because they do not contain a true statement of the case. And such exaggerations necessarily tend to weaken the force of Christian doctrine, and the conviction which results from the internal and practical evidences of its truth.

But this is not the whole extent of the evil. For unfortunately these exaggerated descriptions of human corruption, whilst they fail of acting upon the conscience, have a powerful effect on the passions of the weak and unreflecting, and naturally serve to kindle and encourage the maladies of religious enthusiasm and self-imposture. For when men are taught that a sense of their own utter and unmixed

depravity is the first, or rather the sole qualification for Regeneration, they endeavour to throw themselves into that posture of mind, which the lesson that they have heard seems to require. Hence they give themselves up to certain vague and desultory feelings of unworthiness, which they mistake for religious convictions, and establish within themselves a kind of factitious conscience, which, whilst it overlooks the specialities of sin, taxes them with utter depravity and a determined hatred of God; and thus calls them off from the task of self-inquiry, and the pursuit of self-knowledge. But the transition from this state of mind to a state directly opposite to it, is easy and natural. For he who can persuade himself that he is exactly such a creature as these views of original sin represent him, will find no difficulty in persuading himself, that he has experienced that mystical change and revolution of soul, on which the corresponding theory of Regeneration insists. Such in fact is the history of the most prevalent kinds of enthusiasm; and it confirms an observation made in a former part of this treatise—that the speculative errors of divines naturally slide into practical errors and fanaticism, when they fall into the hands of the weak, the passionate, and the injudicious.

One other consequence of this theory is, that it ministers to the pride and vanity of the human heart, by shifting its religious convictions and self-condemnation from a consciousness of personal un-

worthiness to feelings or confessions of natural unworthiness and necessary sinfulness. Where just views of religion are entertained, a sense of natural unworthiness is the result of clear and deep convictions of personal faultiness. But in a system which contemplates every man as utterly depraved by the necessity of his nature, and devoid of every spark and remnant of goodness, the idea of personal unworthiness will be merged in a vague feeling of natural depravity. It is easy to say, what has been confidently asserted by many Calvinistic divines, that this necessity of sinning is an aggravation of man's personal guilt, and is therefore the strongest ground that can be laid for humility and self-abasement. Common sense revolts against this assertion, and experience unequivocally refutes it. With respect to pious and sober-minded men,—and many such there are among the speculative advocates of this opinion,—sound sense and the power of religious principles neutralize the effects of an erroneous theory. But, with the exception of a comparatively small and fluctuating body of novices and aspirants, the great number of those who entertain these views of human nature, imagine themselves already regenerated; and the contrast between themselves and the unregenerate part of mankind, gives an irresistible fascination to the opinions which they have adopted. And they are well contented to place their former state in the blackest point of view, in

order that they may derive the greater satisfaction from contemplating their regenerate condition.

Upon the whole, then, I am persuaded, that this theory of Regeneration, resting, as it does, on these exaggerated views of the depravity of our common nature, involves in it consequences highly unfavourable to the simplicity and genuine character of the Gospel dispensation.

But in addition to these consequences, and the opposition which the theory presents to the plainest principles of natural and revealed religion, the definition of Regeneration, which it commonly assumes, is inconsistent with those sober and just views of our nature, in its renewed and improved state, which we may collect from Scripture and experience. At all events it is not such a definition as can be propounded with safety to the great body of our Christian brethren.

A prudent divine, who understands the true force and meaning of words, will be cautious of pronouncing that change which is effected in the act of Regeneration, *an entire change of heart or mind, or a radical change of all the parts and faculties of the soul*. Nay, a prudent divine, though he will allow that these expressions may be applied, in a qualified and comparative sense, to highly improved Christians, will rather choose to abstain from the use of them. Well advised and humble men will not readily appropriate such terms to themselves, be-

cause, though they cannot be too thankful for the change which they have undergone, they are aware that it is far from being entire either in parts or degrees. And we are too well acquainted with the mischievous effects of such language on weak and passionate minds, and know by experience how well calculated it is to inflame the vanity of the human heart, and to give birth to every species of enthusiasm, and every degree of self-sufficiency.

CHAPTER XII.

CONCLUSION—CONTAINING SOME REMARKS ON THE
HARMONY OF THE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION
IN BAPTISM WITH THE DRIFT AND PRINCIPLES
AND MORAL EVIDENCES OF REVEALED RELIGION.

I HAVE now pursued my researches into the grounds and theory of the doctrine of Regeneration through the several heads of inquiry, which I proposed in the outset of this treatise. After premising some remarks on the obvious advantages of adhering as much as possible to the strict and determinate usage of words, in the different branches of human knowledge, and particularly in theological inquiries and controversies, I proceeded to lay before my readers a statement of the opinions of the ancient Christians on this subject of Regeneration, and of the principles on which their usage of the word seems to depend.

After this I investigated the Scriptural authorities for this doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, and examined the principal exceptions which have been taken to it from other passages of Holy Writ. I then pointed out the strict conformity between the ancient Christians and our own Church in this head of doctrine, and noticed the attempts which have been made to extract a different opinion from our public writings. Afterwards I inquired more at large into the theory of this doctrine, the several variations which have been made from the language and opinions of the Church, and the theory which has been opposed to it with the greatest confidence: and I have pointed out some difficulties with which this latter theory is incumbered, and some consequences which obviously flow from it.

In the conduct of this inquiry it has been my object to show,

1. That in Scripture, Baptism is considered as the commencement of a new period, as an epoch of the religious life, from whence the Christian dates a new state of spiritual existence, carrying with it new privileges, capacities of action, and expectations; or, in other words, a *state of salvation*.

2. That the Sacrament of Baptism is not only the symbol and seal, but the channel and organ of that inward grace, of which it is, in a strict and sacramental sense, the outward and visible sign.

3. That the grace conferred in Baptism, and

expressed in Scripture by a variety of phrases and figures of speech, is not, strictly speaking, a practical change, such a change, I mean, as must be tested by consciousness, and experience, and results, but a change of state and relative condition, accompanied with an earnest or first principle of new life, and a promise of such spiritual power, as may enable the recipient to continue in this state of salvation, and to carry on that moral and practical change, which this mystical change implies and requires.

4. That the change which has been stated and described in the course of this treatise, was, in strict accordance with the language of Scripture, usually denominated Regeneration by the whole body of the ancient Christians.

5. That in this head of doctrine our Church has kept close to the language and sentiments of Christian antiquity, distinguishing the sacramental grace from the qualifications which it requires, and the effects which it is intended to produce; and using the word Regeneration, in its Articles and Liturgy, to signify solely and singly the grace conferred on Christians in Baptism.

6. That the Scriptures uniformly contemplate the moral and practical change of the human soul as effected through the medium of moral instruments; and never suppose that spiritual habits are formed in another manner, or follow another order, than such habits as are purely and exclusively moral.

7. That, consequently, the theory which contemplates Regeneration as an infusion or implantation of habits, or as a turning point from evil to good, attended with an entire change of mind, or a radical change of the parts and faculties of the soul, is not only inconsistent with the reasonable and moral constitution of man, but at variance with the nature and purposes of revealed religion. And that it is built on metaphysical positions which will not bear the test of examination, and on such exaggerated views of man's sinfulness and degraded condition, as have no foundation in experience or Scripture, and involve consequences injurious to the cause of truth, and the interests of pure and unadulterated Christianity.

Nothing now remains but to add, by way of conclusion, a few remarks on the harmony of the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism with the drift and principles of revealed religion, and its consistency with the internal evidences and moral tendencies of the Christian dispensation.

The Christian revelation, considered apart from the principles of natural religion, which it supposes and adopts, is a remedial dispensation, framed for the benefit of creatures in a fallen and diseased state: and is intended to counteract such evils as could not be subdued by the ordinary means, or did not fall within the scope of reason and natural religion. Previous to the preaching of the Gospel,

and the more extensive dissemination of the knowledge contained in the Holy Scriptures, man's ignorance of God's nature, and his own duty, of his origin and business in this world, of the ends of his creation, and of his future prospects, showed the great need of a particular revelation, accompanied with sufficient evidence, and calculated for general instruction. For it could not be expected that reason and natural religion, which had not prevented him from falling into this state, would prove sufficient remedies for his ignorance, or relieve him from his difficulties and distresses. It is true that the human understanding was never so totally and universally darkened, as not to perceive at times the reasonableness and excellence of many of the first truths of morality and religion. Still, however, the uncertainty under which the wisest of the heathens laboured in their views and notions of these subjects is a convincing argument of the necessity of a more explicit communication of religious knowledge ; and is a convincing internal evidence of the truth of that revelation, which has brought this knowledge within the comprehension, and rendered it familiar to the minds, of the uneducated and illiterate.

The advantage, therefore, and necessity of an explicit revelation of the main truths and principles of religion, are clearly made out from the history of mankind, and from that ignorance of the truth which was universally prevalent, and was acknowledged and

lamented by the wisest and most thinking of the heathens. But if this revelation had been nothing more than a republication, or a clearer and more exact development of the truths of natural religion, it would not have corresponded with man's wants, nor satisfied his feelings and conscience. For the more clearly the principles of natural religion are explained, and the consequences of violating its obligations set forth, the more forcibly will man feel the imperfections of his own performances, the guilt which he has contracted, and the punishment to which he has exposed himself. Man, contemplating himself as a religious and responsible creature, discovers that he is a sinner, and that the principles of natural religion, and the authority of conscience, are insufficient to stimulate him to duty, and to curb his evil affections and propensities. Arguing then from his own experience, and the general appearances of the moral world, he will probably conclude, independently of positive revelation, that this bias to sin is inherent in his nature, and will from thence justly infer, that he cannot be an object of his Maker's favour, whilst he continues in this state of guilt and corruption. But here natural religion can do nothing for him, or at least offers him no sufficient means of quieting his fears, or healing his inherent maladies. He may perhaps build some hopes or presumptions of forgiveness on the supposed efficacy of repentance, or on his natural

notions and revealed knowledge of God's benevolence. But these presumptions are insufficient to quiet his apprehensions, because they do not furnish him with such a remedy for the effects and dominion of sin, as can satisfy his understanding, and compose his conscience. Hence arises the necessity, or at least the expediency and manifest advantage, of a revelation of a remedial nature, and of a promise of forgiveness, established on sufficient grounds and satisfactory evidence. But at the same time man must be sensible that the forgiveness of his sins, and his restoration to God's favour, cannot supersede the principles of natural religion, and his obligations to obey the will of God. He will therefore look to revelation for assurances of some new and supernatural powers, to enable him to resist and counteract his inherent bias to evil and tendency to decay, and to give spring and elasticity to his moral and religious endeavours. But it is a strong internal evidence of the truth of the Gospel dispensation, that it professes to supply mankind with such a remedy for sin, and such spiritual assistances, as the acknowledged and experimental evils of their situation seem to demand.

But the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism tallies and harmonizes with this scheme of revealed religion. Assuming the inspiration of the Scriptures and the truth of every article of natural and revealed religion contained in them—particularly

the divinity and incarnation of our Saviour, the atonement and satisfaction which have been made to Almighty God for the sins of the whole world by his death upon the cross, and the infallible certainty of that promise of the Holy Ghost, which He has made to his whole Church, and to every faithful member of it—it enforces the authority of God's word, and brings home the truths of revealed religion to every man's bosom, by assuring us that God consigns over to the individual Christian his share in the saving effects of his Redeemer's sufferings, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost, in a form and order of his own appointment. But this doctrine contents itself with the simplicity of the scriptural statement. It does not pave the way for its own reception by such exaggerated descriptions of man's natural and necessary depravity, as are inconsistent with his history and experience, and therefore cannot be brought home to the *real* conscience of the sinner. Nor does it indulge in any such exaggerated accounts of the act of Regeneration itself, and its immediate and necessary effects, as can fascinate the understandings, and minister to the vanity of the weak and injudicious. The sum of what it teaches us is, that the forgiveness of sins, purchased for us by the death of the Son of God, the gift or earnest of the Holy Ghost, which He has promised to us, and a conditional title to eternal life, purchased by his death, and issuing from the

free grace of God, are made over in Baptism to infants and adults duly qualified, without any distinction or respect of persons; and that Baptism is, according to the plain lesson of Scripture, the ordinary instrument of Regeneration.

In this theory, therefore, those remedies for sin and sinfulness, which the Gospel of Christ proffers to mankind, are contemplated as made over to us individually, through the medium of an outward sign, and certified to our faith in a simple and affecting ceremony, and in a way excellently calculated to enhance the mercy and free grace of God, and to minister to our comfort and improvement. It does not presume to inform us in what way, or to what extent, the Holy Spirit acts upon the soul in Baptism, nor how He stamps and seals us as God's property: but it looks upon our Regeneration as an entrance into a state of Christian life, which is a life of trial and education; and therefore considers that change of disposition and habits, and that complete renewal of the soul which some divines speak of as the very essence of the new birth, as its legitimate and intended, but not as its necessary consequence. Man is brought into a state of salvation and a covenant of repentance in Baptism, but his final salvation depends on the issue of a state of trial. But if the satisfaction of Christ salves the honour of God's laws, and composes and relieves the sinner's conscience, and if the promise of the Holy

Ghost is a comfort and encouragement to weak and sinful creatures, we may reasonably believe (and we are firmly persuaded that Scripture affords ample grounds for this article of belief) that our interest in these blessings is made over to us at some definite point of time, and through the medium of a sensible action, to which we can refer back with an assurance of faith, without being left in a state of doubt and suspense, or being tempted to have recourse to fallible and uncertain criterions.

It is true that many strange and lamentable consequences have been supposed to flow from this doctrine by writers, who appear to think that the essence and spirituality of religion are intimately connected with their own views of Regeneration; and have in consequence been more studious to maintain their own principles than to acquaint themselves with the merits of the opposite theory. But these consequences do not flow from the opinions and statements of the advocates of this doctrine, but from opinions, which exist no where (so far at least as any parties to this controversy are concerned) but in the warm imaginations and jealous fears of its opponents. That no man, who has not been baptized, can possibly enter into the kingdom of heaven; that hypocrites and profligate men are delivered from their sins, and endowed with the Holy Ghost in Baptism, no less than true penitents and sincere believers; and that the baptismal action is always

accompanied with a radical change of all the parts and faculties of the soul, are indeed fearful propositions, and pregnant with absurd and mischievous consequences. But since they are propositions which no one has advanced, and represent opinions which no one entertains, they may be safely left to their own fate.

In fact, the question at issue has been completely shifted, and placed upon a new bottom, by the advocates of the theory of Regeneration which has been canvassed. The real question is, whether, according to the doctrine of Scripture, the primitive and constant tradition of the ancient Churches, and the decided sense of the Church of England, Regeneration is the inward and spiritual grace of Baptism. The question argued by the other party has been—whether a thorough change of heart, an implantation of grace, an entire change of mind, or a radical change of all the parts and faculties of the soul, always take place in this sacrament. But this mode of stating and arguing the question can be productive of no good effects, nor lead to any just conclusions; for it either assumes the very point on which the controversy hinges, or has recourse to the most paltry of all sophisms, a mere verbal equivocation.

Had indeed those descriptions and definitions of Regeneration, which I have had such frequent occasion to cite, occurred in writings of an oratorical

cast, or in pathetic appeals to the feelings of the reader, though I could not have approved the Author's judgment, every just allowance would have been made for rhetorical exaggeration. But when they occur in treatises, or argumentative and controversial discourses, which profess to handle the theory and doctrinal parts of religion, and to treat the subjects under review systematically; especially when the authors substitute their own definitions for the words used by their opponents; they can have no claim to indulgence on this score: and probably the writers themselves would be the first to disclaim any interpretations, which would palliate their expressions, or soften down and extenuate their opinions.

Several reasons have induced me to pursue my inquiries, and arrange and publish my sentiments on this subject. Many excellent and orthodox statements of this doctrine have been given to the world, and it has been touched upon, professedly or incidentally, by several of our most eminent divines. But I know of no book which contains a general and systematic view of its bearings and authorities, of the objections which have been made, and the theories which have been opposed to it. I could not but apprehend that much danger must accrue to the evidences of religion, from setting up novel opinions and private interpretations of Scripture in opposition to the received doctrine and

unanimous testimony of the whole Church of Christ, from the days of the Apostles to the time of the Reformation. I perceived the evil consequences which would result both to the Ministers of our Church, and to their congregations, from the attempts which have been made to explain away the clear and unequivocal language of our baptismal offices. And I saw with regret, that the theory, which is principally opposed to this doctrine, substitutes a scheme of necessity for the probationary system of scriptural religion, removes the appeal which the Gospel makes to mankind from the conscience to the passions, fascinates the human understanding, and flatters the vanity of the human heart, and naturally slides into such a shape as generates enthusiastic notions, and leads the way to habits of self-delusion.

But I have insisted the more largely on this subject, because it is closely combined with just and scriptural views of the great importance and spiritual effects of Baptism, which almost every other statement of the doctrine of Regeneration either invalidates or annihilates: and because it is of much moment to a right conception of the general scheme and nature of the Christian covenant. For according to the terms of this covenant, *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved*¹, and he that is bap-

¹ Mark xvi. 16.

tized, must *observe all things whatsoever Christ commanded his disciples*². The Gospel covenant, therefore, is a covenant of grace on God's part, and of belief and obedience on the part of man; and, consequently, it contemplates the Christian life as a real and unsophisticated state of probation, in which free grace and free obedience, justification in God's sight, and repentance and holiness of life, are correlatives, and imply each other; and man, who has been redeemed, and pardoned, and endowed with the Holy Ghost, has duties to perform, and conditions to fulfil, must continue stedfast in the faith, and must endeavour *to walk in all the commandments of the Lord blameless*³, and *to have a conscience void of offence toward God and toward man*⁴.

But the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism fixes the commencement of the Christian life in the right place, and secures the doctrine of universal grace within the pale of the Church, and the comprehension of the covenant, against every system which savours of necessity or favouritism, of absolute decrees, or capricious preferences. Without pretending to account for the gradual development of the truth, and the partial propagation of the Gospel, or for remarkable instances of God's special grace, which must be resolved into his unsearchable purposes, it teaches us, that such baptized adults as are

² Matt. xxviii. 20.

³ Luke i. 6.

⁴ Acts xxiv. 16.

believers and penitents, and baptized infants, who can present no bar of unbelief and impenitence, receive in this sacrament the forgiveness of sins, and the gift or earnest of the Holy Ghost, as a principle of new and spiritual life ; and are placed in a state of salvation, of which nothing but human negligence and default can deprive them. Still, however, it teaches us that this state is not only a state of grace, but a state of discipline and trial ; and that the child of God and inheritor of the kingdom of heaven, if he is wanting to his own soul, or is neglected and undone by the guardians of his early days, will become the child of the devil, and the inheritor of everlasting misery.

We may collect, indeed, from the passages of St. John's first Epistle, which have been referred to in a former part of this treatise, that this doctrine was soon perverted to bad purposes, and the history of the Church will furnish us with other instances of its misapplication and perversion. And it may be asked, what doctrine has not in its turn been corrupted and abused ? But I am confident that no man who really understands this doctrine, and is not prejudiced against it either by a strange misapprehension of its drift and nature, or by an attachment to some favourite hypothesis, can discover in it any dangerous or immoral tendency, or any aptness to produce formality, security, presumption, or self-conceit. With us at least, in

our public formularies, it is guarded against every misconstruction, and intimately connected with the probationary life, and the necessity of religious exertion and growing holiness. Such too is the use to which it is applied by the ministers of our Church in public and private, in the school, the pulpit, and all their pastoral instructions. A variety of practical lessons are built upon it in their addresses to parents and children, to the young, the old, the sinner, the penitent, and the confirmed Christian; and it is pressed on the memories and consciences of their hearers, as a motive to vigilance, self-jealousy, resistance to temptation, repentance, exertion, and perseverance. They firmly believe and thankfully acknowledge that the children whom they have baptized have been grafted into Christ's body, and constituted and declared children of God; and their labours are directed to these points—that they may be reared and educated as spiritual and immortal creatures: that the children of God may not become children of wrath and children of the devil; and that those Christians who have fallen away from God's grace, and forfeited the hopes and privileges of their calling, may be renewed again to repentance, and restored to the household and family of Christ.

Whilst the Christian minister makes this use and practical application of it, he need not fear to advocate a doctrine grounded on the sure basis of

Scripture, witnessed by all antiquity, and unequivocally asserted by our own Church. Security, presumption, self-conceit, and the other vices which have been strangely characterized as its natural consequences, he must expect to find in abundance. They are owing to the want of that religious education which forms an important part of our Christian trial, where the interests of the young are intrusted, according to the known analogy of God's natural and moral government, to the care of other persons; and their spiritual welfare, without the continual interference of miraculous causes, must necessarily be involved in the good conduct and fidelity of their parents and instructors. They are occasioned by evil habits and bad examples, by the cares of this world and the lusts of the flesh, by inattention to the concerns of religion, and by an imperfect acquaintance with the nature of Christianity, and of the privileges and obligations of the baptismal covenant; and, not unfrequently, by those fanatical notions of Regeneration, which are no uncommon fruits of a departure from orthodox opinion. But I am persuaded that he will seldom, I may almost say, will never, within the sphere of his own duties, find them grounded on any misconstruction of this important doctrine.

The minister of the Church, therefore, who has no wish to sacrifice the simple and plain meaning of its public offices to refined speculations and subtle

evasions, whilst he yields hearty thanks to God in the prayers of the Church, “that it hath pleased him to regenerate” the child that has been baptized “with his Holy Spirit,” and “humbly beseeches him to grant that he may thenceforth crucify the old man, and in the end utterly abolish the whole body of sin,” will speak the same language, and inculcate the same doctrine in his discourses. He will follow up in his ministerial labours the tenour of those sound and pious exhortations, with which he has dismissed the sponsors and guardians of the infant, and will look forward with a mixture of hope and fear to his future renovation and improvement :—“Remembering always that Baptism doth represent unto us our profession, which is to follow the example of Christ, and to be made like unto him; that as he died and rose again for us, so should we, who are baptized, die from sin, and rise again unto righteousness, continually mortifying our evil and corrupt affections, and daily proceeding in all virtue and godliness of living ^s.”

^s Office for public Baptism (concluding exhortation).

APPENDIX,
CONTAINING
REMARKS ON MR. FABER'S
PRIMITIVE DOCTRINE OF REGENERATION.

I

APPENDIX.

SINCE the publication of the third edition of this work, in 1839, Mr. Faber has published a volume, which he calls "The Primitive Doctrine of Regeneration;" the object of which is to support the opinions which he had maintained on this subject, in a volume of Sermons, published many years ago, by the authority of the fathers of the four first centuries.

As Mr. Faber appeared to me to have entirely failed in his attempt to identify his own statements with those of these pious and primitive writers; as my own views of the question remained unaltered, and as I had no wish to embark any further in this controversy, I abstained from making any observations on his work, at the time of its publication. I did not even think it necessary to disclaim the opinions which he has ascribed to me, or to correct his misconception of my real sentiments.

But I had noticed the erroneous principles on

which Mr. Faber has relied, and several mistakes into which he has fallen, owing partly to the medium through which he has viewed the question ; partly to the hasty manner in which his collections have apparently been made, and the eagerness with which he has seized on such passages of the writings of the fathers as seemed favourable to his own opinions. Some of these have since been pointed out by Mr. T. K. Arnold in his Remarks on Mr. Faber's treatise. Mr. Arnold has likewise drawn my attention to other inaccuracies which had escaped my notice ¹.

Since, however, a fourth edition of my work is now called for, I think it necessary to make some remarks on Mr. Faber's volume, principally, as regards its leading principles, and the erroneous view which he has taken of the language and opinions of the writers whom he has cited as witnesses.

Mr. Faber, in his first book, treats of what he calls the "Ideality of Regeneration."

He tells us, "that modern theologians have propounded three systems, claiming to exhibit the true sense of Scripture, respecting Regeneration and Baptism."

"In the first of these systems, Regeneration is not considered as an internal change in the fallen soul of man, but only as an external change in man's relative state towards God.

¹ Inaccurate translations, especially,—a part of the work which I seldom looked into.

“In the second system, it is considered as a moral change of disposition, associated with a federal change of relative condition, always accompanying Baptism, except in the case of impenitent and hypocritical recipients.”

“In the third system, Regeneration is considered as a moral change of disposition, associated with a federal change of relative condition; and Baptism is, by divine appointment, its outward and visible sign. This change is identical with conversion, renovation, or repentance, and may take place either before, or at, or after Baptism.”

Whether any theologians, ancient or modern, have maintained the first of these systems, I will not undertake to affirm or deny. At all events, it differs widely from Waterland's doctrine, as stated and explained by himself, and from the opinions of the writer of this work, whom Mr. Faber mentions as one of its advocates. In fact, there is scarcely a chapter in this book, which does not show that the system there adopted, if system it may be called, is very different from that which Mr. Faber supposes him to have espoused. (Note A.)

I will, therefore, substitute for Mr. Faber's statement, the following account of the real opinion of those writers whom he considers as the advocates of the first system; keeping as closely as I can to his form of expression.

Regeneration is a change in the spiritual state of

fallen man, wrought in him by the operation of the Holy Ghost, carrying with it and implying the remission of sin original and actual, and a first principle of new life imparted to the soul, and thus producing a change in his relative state toward God. And Baptism is, by God's appointment, not only its outward and visible sign, but a sure witness, and *effectual* sign of the grace then given, by which He does work invisibly in us².

This is the system (to adopt Mr. Faber's expression) which the writings of those fathers of the Church, whom he has endeavoured to press into the service of his own opinions, appear to me to exhibit. It is the system which Waterland has derived from their works, and which has been followed, as must be obvious to every one who has read his book with common attention, by the writer of this treatise.

Those fathers, likewise, constantly observed that distinction which Mr. Faber has attempted to controvert and set aside, between Regeneration, which properly denotes the inward grace of the sacrament of Baptism, and those other graces and fruits of the Spirit (repentance, conversion, and the growth and

² Article XXV. *Signum efficax*; a sign which effects, in a subordinate manner, that which it signifies. Those writers who quote the XXVIIth Article, to prove that Baptism is only a *sign*, and not a *means* or channel of Regeneration, usually omit all reference to this definition of a sacramental sign in the XXVth Article.

progress of the new or Christian life) which Waterland and other divines designate by the term renovation. But this is not, as Mr. Faber seems to think, a mere verbal distinction, but a distinction of things essentially different both in theory and in fact. It is not denied that the word Renovation, in its primary and more extensive meaning, may be applied to Baptism as well as to those other spiritual changes, or that it is one of the terms by which Baptism is often denominated by the ancients: but it has been used in the secondary and restricted sense with great propriety, because it is the sense in which it is almost always used in the New Testament. The distinction itself, independently of the term employed to denote it, pervades not only the writings of the fathers, but the services of our Church, and the scriptures of the New Testament.

In fact, those changes which Mr. Faber calls Moral Regeneration, and which, as he contends, are both the essence and evidence of the new birth, are what those divines, whose opinions he seems to be opposing, call Renovation. The passages, therefore, as might be expected, which he has quoted from the fathers as vouchers for the doctrine, that Regeneration is neither necessarily nor ordinarily connected with Baptism, are irrelevant to his purpose. For they either speak of that spiritual change, or first disposition to newness of life, which they believed to take

place in Baptism ; or else they describe the development of the spiritual principle, and that progress and advance of the new life, which is, or rather ought to be, the consequence of the new birth.

This substitution of the term Moral Regeneration for Renovation (repentance, conversion of the heart, spiritual edification and improvement) is a paralogism which runs through Mr. Faber's work, and obscures and perplexes the question at issue. It assumes that the grace of Regeneration is not a mysterious and potential principle of new life ; but either that progressive and conscious change which the word *Moral* properly denotes, or something equivalent to it ; a change which is always either attended or followed by discernible effects. From hence, the conclusion follows, that there is no necessary nor ordinary connexion between the outward sign and the inward grace of this sacrament. But this is not the primitive doctrine of Regeneration, nor the doctrine taught by those writers of the four first centuries, to whom Mr. Faber appeals : for they teach with one accord, that the new birth or grace of Regeneration is, according to the ordinary tenor of God's dispensations, conveyed to the soul through the medium of water in Baptism³.

The passages quoted by Mr. Faber (p. 30, &c.)

³ Mr. Faber has perplexed the question, and probably misled himself, by adopting this term, Moral Regeneration. *Regenera-*

from Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, (with the exception of that relating to the adulteress, of which notice is taken in another part of this volume,) Tertullian, Athanasius, ⁴ Cyril of Jerusalem, and Augustine, are exactly such as those advocates of the

tion is a spiritual grace ; and, in a certain sense, every spiritual grace may be said to be moral, because it effects a change in man's moral nature. But the word Moral, to speak more properly, implies choice and consciousness and self-action, and faculties or dispositions expanding themselves into habits ; and hence moral graces or virtues are, as Waterland expresses himself, " the joint work of the Spirit and of the man." This is the sense in which Mr. Faber seems to use the word *Regeneration* ; and consequently, it is in his system equivalent to what Waterland calls (using the word in a secondary and restricted sense) *Renovation*, and, in strict conformity with the doctrine of the Church and of Christian antiquity, carefully distinguishes from *Regeneration*.

⁴ In his quotation from Cyril, Mr. Faber has mistaken the meaning of his author. He does not, as Mr. Faber evidently supposes, distinguish between an outward *Regeneration* of the body, and an inward *Regeneration* of the soul. He is exhorting the Catechumens to put off their sins, by partaking of the spiritual grace of Baptism. After calling upon them to prepare themselves through faith for the new birth into freedom and adoption, he says, " Come for the mystical seal, that you may be well known to the Master ; be ye numbered with the holy and spiritual flock of Christ ; so shall ye be set on his right hand, and inherit the life that is prepared for you. For they who are yet encompassed with the rough covering of their sins, have their lot on his left hand, because they come not to the grace of God which is given through Christ at the new birth of the bath. I speak not of a new birth of our bodies, but of the spiritual new birth of the soul. For our bodies are born by means of parents, but our

doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration, whom Mr. Faber supposes himself to be controverting, but whose real opinion he has altogether mistaken, produce as their witnesses. For they hold, in common with these fathers, that Regeneration is not merely a federal change of relative condition, but a spiritual change wrought in the soul of man.

The quotations from Cyprian and Lactantius describe the development of the spiritual principle, and the change wrought in the habits and lives of regenerate men,—subsequently to, in some degree, perhaps, concurrently with Baptism.

The quotation from Jerome, when taken with its context, is in no respect at variance with the opinions of the divines in question.

The passages produced by Mr. Faber to show that the fathers considered Regeneration as a federal change of relative condition, do not contemplate this as merely a change of outward circumstances and condition, but as a spiritual change, a work of the Holy Ghost, acting upon the soul.

The extraordinary opinion (p. 53) that the fathers

souls are born again by means of faith."—*Oxford Library of the Fathers.*

Mr. Faber translates this passage, *I speak not of a mere Regeneration of their bodies*, as if the object of Cyril had been to teach that there may be a new birth of the body in Baptism, where there is no new birth of the soul. Whereas, what Cyril says, is, that he is not speaking of a new birth of the natural body, but of the spiritual new birth of the soul.

viewed Baptism in the light of a double sacrament, intended to convey a twofold new birth, is founded on a misconception equally extraordinary of the passages adduced in its support. So far were they from entertaining such a notion, that, though they constantly held that in the case, not only of hypocrites and impenitents, but of persons baptized in heresy or schism, no saving grace is communicated in Baptism, they did not even then shut out the Spirit from that ordinance, but conceived that the person so baptized was born again to a greater condemnation, and continued in that state till changed by Repentance, but that he was neither illuminated, nor sanctified, nor renewed by the Holy Spirit.

Mr. Arnold has pointed out the mistake into which Mr. Faber has fallen, in the view which he has taken of the quotation from Augustine, (p. 60.) that a man "may be baptized with water, and not born of the Spirit;" being, as he shows, not Augustine's doctrine, but the absurd conclusion following on his opponent's premises ⁵.

How Mr. Faber could have imagined that Cyprian (pp. 56. 60.) was speaking of the sacrament of Baptism as a two-fold sacrament, it is difficult to conjecture. Had he attended to the state of the question in debate, and to the scope and object of the Epistle from which he makes this quotation,

⁵ I have examined the passage, and find that Mr. Arnold's view of it is quite correct.

he must have perceived that that father was not speaking of a two-fold Baptism, but of the two sacraments, as he calls them, of Baptism and Imposition of hands ⁶.

Since it appears, then, that Mr. Faber has mistaken the opinions both of those writers, whom he supposes to have been the advocates of what he calls the first system, and of the fathers whom he has cited in his first book ; it seems scarcely necessary to enter into a very particular examination of the subsequent parts of his volume. In fact, most of his statements and arguments have been answered by anticipation in the treatise to which this appendix is subjoined.

But I may be allowed to doubt whether there are any theologians of our Church, who hold those views of "inseparability," which Mr. Faber attributes to the advocates of his second system. Mr. F. allows that they exclude hypocrites and impenitents from the spiritual benefits of Baptism. But is there any reason for supposing that they exclude from the kingdom of heaven, those persons dying, whilst unbaptized, in whose favour the primitive Christians made exceptions, on grounds of what Hooker calls "natural" equity ? those, *i. e.*, who were prevented from being baptized by causes, over which they had no controul. Martyrs, for instance, who were said figuratively to

⁶ Some remarks on this passage will be found in the treatise, c. 6. p. 86. *third edition.*

be baptized in their own blood, (Note B.) and those Catechumens who, having a full purpose of being baptized, were prevented by death or other unavoidable accidents. Probably too, like our own Church, they would not venture, with Augustine and the Church of Rome, to exclude from that kingdom the infants of Christian parents, dying without Baptism.

It will be found, if I mistake not, that the only systems advocated by divines of our Church, are that which considers Baptism to be, according to the ordinary tenor of God's dispensations, the appointed means or channel of Regeneration,—and that which maintains, that though it may sometimes, and in some sense or other take place in Baptism, that sacrament is not, either by institution or in point of fact, the necessary, or even the ordinary means of Regeneration.

Mr. Faber, in his second book, considers "Baptism, a devout reception of Christ, and the word of God," as three distinct channels, through either of which the new birth may be conveyed, independently of the other. Probably, however, he will not insist on the distinction which he lays down between the word of God, and a devout reception of Christ; *i. e.* faith in that word. In proof of this position, he cites passages of Scripture, in which the new birth is attributed to the word, or to faith in the word, without any mention of Baptism. But they who take what I conceive to be a more correct view of

this question,—while they believe that the word of God, joined with faith in that word, confers a saving efficacy on the waters of Baptism, sanctifying them to the mystical washing away of sin, and the mystical renewal of the human soul,—believe likewise, that Baptism, according the ordinary tenor of God's dispensations, is the appropriate means or channel of the new birth. On the one hand, they hold, that, when Regeneration is ascribed to Baptism, the word and faith in that word are supposed, or implied; on the other hand, that, when men are said to be born again of the word, or, what amounts to the same thing, through receiving Christ, or faith in that word; water and Baptism are, in virtue of our Lord's institution, implied and understood. Thus, though the word sanctifies the water; and faith in Christ, and in his promises, is required in Baptism; still Baptism is the channel through which the special grace of Regeneration is conferred. Hence, since the word, and faith in the word, and Baptism are, so to speak, concurrent causes of the new birth; we *must* supply from one passage of Scripture what is implied, though not expressed in another; conceiving that in this case, neither the word is to be separated from the water, nor the water from the word, nor the word and the water from faith⁷.

Mr. Faber, in the course of his arguments, affirms

⁷ See c. v. p. 62 of this treatise.

that in the language and doctrine of the early Christian writers, Circumcision and Baptism were considered as identical (p. 94); and this identity he calls *a ruled case*. It is almost needless to say, that he has totally mistaken their opinion, and that the ruled case (to adopt his own phrase) is the reverse of what he states it to be. For, even the passages which he brings forward in support of this paradox⁸, are a sufficient confutation of it, and show that they did not look on Circumcision as identical with Baptism, but as analogous to it, as a type, shadow, similitude, &c. of the evangelical sacrament⁹. (Note C.)

Enough, perhaps, has been said, in this treatise, of the system adopted by Mr. Faber, (bk. ii. c. 5.) which

⁸ Mr. Faber is pleased to attribute the denial of this identity of Circumcision and Baptism to certain speculative and paradoxical moderns. They are, however, the speculations and paradoxes of the writers whom he brings forward as his witnesses. See c. iv. p. 49, &c. of this treatise.

⁹ My view of the texts quoted by Mr. Faber, from St. John's Epistles, are stated at some length in the treatise. In the passages which he has quoted from Augustine's Homilies on these Epistles, the same line of argument is pursued. The reasonings of the Apostle, and of the father who has trodden in his steps, resemble those of St. Paul in the text on which Mr. Faber dwells at some length. (Rom. ii. 28, 29.) The object of the writers in both cases being to call men off from dwelling on the privileges that had been bestowed on them, to the present and actual state of their hearts and lives. See also John viii. 37—40. It is a mode of arguing, which resembles those comments on, and applications of Scripture, which divines call "tropological," which give, i. e., a moral turn to its literal sense. (Note D.)

resolves the plain and unambiguous statements of the fathers, and the authoritative declarations of the Church, into *the language of charity*; or into what he calls, in the present volume, *official declarations, technical phraseology, and general language*. But this system is widely different from that of the witnesses whom he cites.

They held, as has been observed, that no saving grace is communicated to those who are baptized in hypocrisy, impenitence, heresy, or schism. But they believed that the grace then withholden, might be obtained through repentance. They did not, however, even in such cases, identify Repentance with Regeneration, but supposed that the grace thus received was in some mysterious manner connected with, or dependent on, the sacrament of Baptism. (Note E.) Neither did they look upon the event, *i. e.* the future conduct and character of the baptized person, as the test of his having been born again, because they considered Regeneration as a principle which was to be developed by the right use of the means of grace, and moral and religious discipline. In illustration of his own theory, Mr. Faber quotes a passage from Clemens Alex. (*Pædag.* l. i. c. 6.) as “exhibiting the precise principle, on which the Church has always *officially* acknowledged the duly baptized to be also morally regenerated.” The principle, he tells us, was this, “that no other actual moment could be ascertained with a sufficiency of tangible

distinctness, to warrant an *official declaration*, that this or that person had been morally regenerated." The words, therefore, which he has printed in capitals, "truly you cannot determine the exact time," he looks upon as a full solution of one of the difficulties which embarrasses his system,—a key, as he calls it, to unlock the meaning of the fathers and of the Church.

Mr. Faber has strung together a number of shreds and patches from a long discourse occupying several folio pages in the original, which in the work, from whence they are taken, have no immediate connexion with or dependence on each other, and then produces those words ¹, as being a key to the meaning of the primitive Christians, and the precise principle on which the Church *officially* acts, when it appears to identify Regeneration with Baptism.

But we do not, I conceive, think very honourably of the Church, when we suppose that her *official* declarations are widely different from her real doctrine; that she speaks positively when she thinks, to say the least, doubtfully; in other words, that she is constantly practising deceit and delusion on the understandings and faith of her unlearned and simple children ².

It seems, too, somewhat strange to make choice of

¹ Οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἔχοις εἰπεῖν τὸν χρόνον.

² Ἀγράμματοι καὶ ἰδιῶται, Acts iv. 13.

a few words from an obscure passage of a single writer, as a key to the meaning of the sufficiently plain and intelligible language which pervades the services of the Church, and the works of those writers to whom Mr. Faber makes his appeal.

But, in fact, this passage lays down a doctrine substantially the reverse of that which Mr. Faber collects from it. What Clemens affirms is, that that particular knowledge of which he is speaking, is not conveyed, like the knowledge which prepares the candidate for Baptism by catechetical instruction, but is taught him at his Baptism by the Holy Ghost; that it comes not by instruction, but by inspiration.

“But since this knowledge (that knowledge, *i. e.* of which he had been speaking) springs up together with illumination,” (*φώτισμα* being one of the terms by which Baptism is commonly designated,) “at once flashing upon the mind, we, who were unlearned, are at once called learners or disciples. Are we then so called because this learning has been added to that which we had before acquired? (*i. e.*, because we have acquired this additional knowledge through the same means as our former stock.) (No.) “For you cannot mention the time when it was so acquired.” (*i. e.* had it been taught you in the usual way, you might have mentioned the time.) “For catechetical instruction leads to faith, and faith at Baptism” (*ἅμα τῷ βαπτίσματι*, at the very time, *i. e.* of Baptism,) “is instructed by the Holy Spirit.” (Note F.)

Thus, this discovery, to which Mr. Faber appears to attach so much importance, turns out to be a groundless fancy; and he is equally mistaken in the view which he takes of those passages of the fathers, and those statements of our own Church, to which he has applied this principle, and which he has, as he supposes, unlocked with this key.

The passages quoted in c. 7. are in entire accordance with the opinions of those writers whom Mr. Faber supposes himself to be controverting. Those taken from the Pseudo-Athanasius, Ambrose, Jerome, and Augustin, c. 8. prove that these writers carefully distinguished Regeneration, which is the spiritual grace of Baptism, from post-baptismal repentance, conversion, &c.

The view which Mr. Faber gives of the grounds, on which the primitive Christians received the lapsed as penitents, without speaking of them as being born again on that occasion, is, to use his own language, "speculative and paradoxical." They looked on them as persons who had fallen from grace, and soiled their baptismal robe, and could only be restored to communion with the Church, through a course of penitential discipline. They considered the grace of Regeneration in Baptism, and the grace bestowed on penitents, as having indeed some analogy each to other, on which account they sometimes call penitence a Baptism with tears, but as distinct in kind and degree.

Thus Gregory Nazianzen, insisting on the danger of breaking the Baptismal covenant, says³;

“And this too, seeing that there is no second Regeneration, nor restoration to the former state, though we seek it ever so earnestly with groans and tears; from which, indeed, there does result (with difficulty indeed, yet nevertheless, there does result) a skinning over of our wounds,” *i. e.* the scar remaining after the wounds have been healed.

So likewise, in a passage which Mr. Faber quotes from Athanasius (p. 189), he makes use of the same language, and lays down, in connexion with other fathers of the Church, a plain and palpable distinction between Regeneration and repentance.

“St. Paul does not say,” (Hebrews vii. 4, 5, 6.) “that it is impossible for man,” (so circumstanced,) “to repent, but that it is impossible for us, under the plea of repentance, to renew again such persons” (*i. e.* to bestow on them again the grace of Regeneration⁴). “For there is a wide difference between their cases. For he who repents ceases indeed from sinning, but retains the scars of his wounds. But

³ Oratio xl. de Baptismo : Καὶ ταῦτα οὐκ οὔσης ἑτέρας ἀναγεννήσεως οὐδὲ ἀναπλάσεως, ἂν ὅτι μάλιστα ἐπερητῶμεν ταύτην ἐν πολλοῖς στεναγμοῖς ἐξ ὧν συνούλωσις μὲν ἔρχεται μόγις ἔρχεται γάρ.

⁴ It may mean, “It is impossible to renew us again;” but the translation which I have given seems preferable. It is to be observed that Athanasius has omitted the words *εἰς μετάνοιαν*, “to repentance.”

he who is baptized puts off the old man, and is renewed, as being born again by the grace of the Holy Spirit."

They were indeed very far from receiving back their penitents to communion without speaking of them as being then born again, because they put the milder constructions on their case, and might hope, on principles of charity, that they had been regenerated in Baptism. For their whole system of penitential discipline went not on the presumption, but on the conviction and assured belief that they had been born again in that sacrament. It was framed for men who had fallen from a state of grace and forfeited the baptismal privileges, and could only recover the blessings which they had lost, (and that too, as was then generally believed, tardily and imperfectly) by a severe and searching course of penitential discipline. The Catechumeni and Pœnitentes were distinct classes. The one, whatever might be their moral and religious state, had not been born again, because they were unbaptized; the other had been born again in Baptism, and had therefore incurred a greater guilt, and subjected themselves to a greater condemnation.

I am not expressing my unqualified approbation of the whole of that discipline, which seems to have defeated itself by an excess of severity. I am only stating what the principle was on which that disci-

pline proceeded ; a principle, as appears to me, quite inconsistent with Mr. Faber's theory.

The passage of St. Paul, (Gal. iv. 19, 20,) is irrelevant to the question. The Apostle there speaks of himself as the spiritual parent of his converts, and tells them that he is again (as it were) "travailing in birth with them," is experiencing anxieties, fears, doubts, &c., resembling those which he underwent when he first brought them to Christ, "till Christ was formed in them;" till they had attained (*i. e.*) to a better knowledge of Christian truth, and a more consistent practice of Christian duties.

The passage which Mr. Faber quotes from Athanasius, part of which I have already adduced, is directly opposed to his theory. In his explanation of Matthew xii. 32, that father asserts the possibility of a post-baptismal repentance, but distinguishes it most plainly and positively from Regeneration. He is combating the opinion of Origen and Theognostus, that the sin or blasphemy against the Holy Ghost, which was unpardonable, consists in falling into sin after Baptism. After quoting their words and refuting the grounds on which they based this opinion, he proceeds to argue the question in the passage which Mr. Faber adduces.

"If this saying had been uttered with an eye to those who sin after Baptism, and their offences are unpardonable, how could Paul confirm his love to

the penitent in Corinth? how could he travail in birth with the Galatians who had fallen away, till Christ was formed again in them? For when he uses the word ‘*again*,’ he shows that they had been already perfected in the Spirit. And why do we condemn Novatus, who annihilates repentance, and asserts that they who sin after Baptism can never be forgiven, if this saying was uttered with reference to those who sin after Baptism? Moreover, what is said in the Epistle to the Hebrews, does not exclude the repentance of those who sin, but shows that in the Catholic Church there is only one, and not any second Baptism. For he is writing to the Hebrews; and lest they should think, according to the custom of their law, that we too had, under the plea (προφάσει) or on the ground of repentance many Baptisms; on this account, he exhorts them, indeed, to repent, but demonstrates that there is one renewal only by Baptism, and not a second, as he says in another Epistle. There is one faith, one Baptism.” (Note G.)

The passages quoted from the fathers in b. ii. c. 9, are for the most part irrelevant, and at all events give no countenance to the conclusion which Mr. Faber has drawn from them; that in the opinion of these primitive writers, men are ordinarily born again, either before, or after, or without Baptism; and that the connexion between Baptism and Regeneration is rather an *official declaration*, than a real

fact. But the quotations from Athanasius (pp. 216, 217, 218,) are specimens of the manner in which he presses into his service passages which have no bearing whatever on the question in debate.

In the quotation from the first Epistle to Serapim, Athanasius is proving from Scripture the unity and joint agency of the Three Persons of the Trinity, and describing the relations which subsist between the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost.

“ The Father (he says) is called the Fountain, and Light. The Son too, in relation to the Father as the Fountain, is called the River; in relation to him as Light, he is called his Brightness. The Father, therefore, being the Light, and the Son his Brightness, (for in matters of this kind we must not be weary of repeating the same thing often,) we may see likewise in the Son the Spirit, wherewith we are enlightened; and when we are enlightened by the Spirit, it is Christ who enlightens us in him (or by him). Again, the Father being called the Fountain, and Christ being called the River, we are said to drink of the Spirit. But when we drink of the Spirit, we drink of Christ. And again, Christ being the true Son, we, when we receive the Spirit, are made sons, are adopted as sons (*υιοποιούμεθα*). But when we are made sons by the Spirit, it is manifest that we are made the sons of God in Christ.” (Note H.)

This passage has not the slightest bearing on the question in debate; the means, *i. e.*, or channel

through which the Spirit of adoption is received, or the time of that occurrence.

Mr. Faber, indeed, takes occasion from the words *Light and Illumination*, to assert (pp. 222, 223), or to repeat a former assertion, that in the early Church the regular and *technical* name of Regeneration was *Illumination*. What he means by a *technical* name, I do not profess to understand. But if he means that *Illumination* and *Regeneration* were used as synonymous terms in the early Church, his assumption is inaccurate. One of the numerous terms by which Baptism was denoted is *φώτισμα*, illumination. But it was under different aspects that it was denominated by these several terms. They who were born again of the Spirit, were likewise considered as enlightened by the Spirit. But neither were these operations of the Spirit looked upon as identical, nor the words by which they were denoted as synonymous. In fact, they are plainly distinguished in this passage of Athanasius ⁵.

The other quotation from Athanasius, *Contra*

⁵ In his translation of this passage, Mr. Faber has made some mistakes, which entirely destroy Athanasius's train of reasoning. The parenthetical words (*τὰ γὰρ αὐτὰ περὶ τούτων μάλιστα οὐκ ὀκνητέον λέγειν πολλάκις*—a manifest reference to *Philippians* iii. 1.) he translates, "We should not grudge to use the same phraseology respecting them both," and then follows up this mistake by rendering the next words, "*Thus we may see, &c.*" Again, the words *πάλιν τε τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄντος πηγῆς, τοῦ δὲ Υἱοῦ ποταμοῦ λεγομένου, πίνειν λεγόμεθα τὸ Πνεῦμα*, he translates, "*Since the Father is the Fountain, and the Son is called the*

Arcanos, Oratio ii. (not iii. as misprinted in Mr. Faber's book,) is equally irrelevant.

He is arguing against the Arians, who called the Logos indifferently, *ποίημα*, *κτίσμα*, and *γέννημα*, "one made, created, or begotten," under the plea that these words were synonymous. His object is to prove, that in Scripture these words are constantly used to denote different things; the word *γεννᾶν*, "to beget," (and its homonymes,) being uniformly restricted to, and implying sonship; so that it did not follow from the Word having been begotten, that He had been likewise made or created.

He confirms and illustrates this position from the use of the word "begotten," in the case of those who were God's sons, not by nature, but by adoption. In their natural state they are said to be made or created; but when they are made sons of God by adoption, they are said to be begotten. He then dwells on this distinction between the true son by nature, and the adopted sons who have "received the Spirit of adoption, whereby they cry, Abba,

River, we are said to drink the Spirit," as if Athanasius had been assigning the reason why we are said to drink the Spirit. Again, *υιοποιούμενοι δὲ τῷ Πνεύματι, δηλονότι ἐν Χριστῷ χηματίζομεν υἱοὶ Θεοῦ*, he translates, "*Wherefore, being made sons by the Spirit, we are called in Christ the sons of God,*"—a translation, which, like the others, destroys the chain of reasoning.

In my translation of this passage, in order to give a clearer view of the argument, I have omitted the passages quoted from Scripture, in proof of the positions laid down by the writer, those passages being parenthetical.

Father. In other words, he says, they are made sons when having received the word, (not the word preached or spoken, but the Word that was made flesh,) they have power given them to become the sons of God. For they who are by nature creatures, could not otherwise become sons than by receiving the Spirit of Him, who is the Son by nature, and the true Son." (Note I.)

This is the sum of the argument contained in the words quoted by Mr. Faber, and in the preceding passage. But they contain no allusion to the means or channel through which the Spirit of adoption is received. The inference, probably, which Mr. Faber would have us draw from this quotation is, that because the words *begetting*, &c., are used without any mention of Baptism, therefore, in Athanasius's opinion, Baptism is not the ordinary means of Regeneration; but that men are "begotten again," indifferently, before, or after, or without Baptism.

Equally, or rather still more irrelevant, are the passages quoted from Clemens Romanus⁶, and Ignatius⁷, which cannot, with any show of probability, be supposed to relate to the questions at issue. What Tertullian⁸ asserts is, that men must repent before Baptism, an opinion which no one disputes. The inference drawn from Irenæus⁹ depends on the

⁶ Clemens Romanus, Epistle ii. 1, 2.

⁷ Ignatius, Ep. ad Eph. s. 9.

⁸ Tertullian de Pœnit. s. 7.

⁹ Irenæus, adversus Hæres. l. v. c. 17.

erroneous principle that Regeneration and renovation are identical, and the terms both synonymous and co-extensive.

It is needless to enter upon any lengthened examination of Mr. Faber's dissertations on Infant Baptism, or of the results at which he has arrived. For they are built on the same grounds as the opinions advanced in the former parts of his volume.—We find here, as there, the term *moral* substituted for *spiritual* Regeneration; the same erroneous position that the word, a saving reception of Christ, and Baptism, are *three distinct and separate channels* through which the grace of Regeneration is conveyed to the recipient; the same endeavour to identify Regeneration with conversion, repentance, and moral and spiritual improvement; and the same notion, that whether a person has or has not been regenerated in Baptism, must be determined by the evidence of experience.

But as it has been constantly held, that in the case of hypocrites (impenitent and unbelieving recipients) no saving grace is conferred in Baptism, because they oppose an obstacle to it, so it was the unvarying doctrine of the Catholic Church, that since infants can present no obstacle to it, they always receive the grace of Regeneration in Baptism. For the Church has believed that it is not the infection of our common nature which is an obstacle to the reception of this grace, but wilful and presumptuous sin.

This doctrine, however, is opposed to Mr. Faber's

views, who maintains that no persons are regenerated in Baptism, except their Regeneration is afterwards attested by their lives and conversation. He therefore contends that original sin is an obstacle to the grace of Baptism; that as repentance and faith are required in adults, so something analogous to them is required in infants, to qualify them for the right and saving reception of Baptism; and that we can only judge from results, whether any individual infant has been thus qualified, and so born again through the means or channel of this sacrament.

Mr. Faber, by framing arguments for his opponents, and answering them on his own principles, appears to have satisfied himself that this is both primitive and sound doctrine. But I may venture to affirm that it is at variance with the doctrine of the Church and of the witnesses whom he cites in his behalf. That qualifications, of which they are incapable, or anything analogous to them, are required of infants to qualify them for the remission of sin, (*i. e.* of original sin,) and for receiving the grace of the Holy Ghost in Baptism; that they, who, when they grow up, exhibit no signs of the turning of their heart to God, are therefore not born again in Baptism; and that the fruits of holiness are the only tests of Regeneration, are opinions unknown to those pious writers. Their doctrine, and the doctrine of the Church, has always been that Baptism was ordained for the remission of sins; that where no obstacle is thrown in the way by the recipient,

his sins are forgiven, and he receives the gift of the Holy Ghost; that since infants can throw no obstacle in the way, they are considered in the light of penitents and believers, so that in their case (as Augustine says) the sacrament of faith (*i. e.* Baptism) supplies the lack of faith.

When reviewing the case of Infant Baptism, Mr. Faber repeats his assertion, that in the primitive doctrine Circumcision was identical with Baptism; that the Circumcision of the heart was the inward grace of Circumcision, and identical with Regeneration: and that the conversion of the heart in Augustine's language is likewise identical with it. It will be sufficient to repeat what has been already stated; that Circumcision was not deemed identical with, but only analogous to Baptism; a type, figure, or shadow of it; that the Circumcision of the heart is not spoken of as the inward grace of that ordinance, but as a moral duty expressed in terms borrowed from it; and that the conversion of the heart is not identified with, but evidently distinguished from Regeneration in the very passage which Mr. Faber has cited from Augustine. (Note K.)

In the fourth chapter of his third book, Mr. Faber states the question in debate, with respect to Infant Baptism, to be: Whether *moral* Regeneration always and invariably attends on Infant Baptism.

Now according to the principles laid down by Mr. Faber, no such question could ever be asked. For

the question then would be: Do they who are baptized in infancy always prove, by the evidence of their lives and conversation, that their hearts have been converted and circumcised? or, in other words, "that their hearts and all their members being mortified from all worldly and carnal lusts, they are in all things obeying God's blessed will?"

But the real question is: Does Regeneration in their case always attend on Baptism? Do infants then receive forgiveness of sins, and that grace of the Holy Ghost, which God pours secretly and mysteriously even into these little ones¹?

The case of the slaughtered infants, which Mr. Faber adduces as an instance of persons regenerated without Baptism, is irrelevant to the question. We may readily conceive that they, as well as the patriarchs and prophets of old times, belonged, by a secret and mysterious dispensation, to the New Testament. But they had no concern with the law of Baptism, nor with the doctrine that the kingdom of heaven must be entered through means of that sacrament.

Mr. Faber, indeed, argues from John iii. 3, that since without Regeneration it is impossible to enter into the kingdom of heaven, and those infants had never been baptized, it must have been believed in the primitive Church, that under certain circum-

¹ Occultissimam Spiritus sui gratiam quam latenter infundit et parvulis.—Augustine.

stances infants might be regenerated without Baptism. But he seems to forget that there is no difference in our Lord's teaching between the term *born again* in the 3rd and in the 5th verses, that the latter verse is only an explanation and expansion of the former; that to be born again, and to be born again of water and of the Spirit are here really identical, and, consequently, that the being born again of water and of the Spirit is that Regeneration without which men cannot enter into, or see, the kingdom of heaven. But rules of this kind, which prescribe any particular action; a particular means or channel, in the present case, through which grace is conferred; always admit of such exceptions as necessity, or, to adopt Hooker's language, "natural equity," obviously requires.

The principle stated by Mr. Faber, as that received by the primitive Christians,—that the beneficial effect of Baptism depends on the faith and sincerity of the sponsors,—was not their principle. Nor do the passages quoted by him give any real countenance to this assertion.

In the *Quæstiones ad Orthodoxos*² the question asked is:—

"If children who die in their infancy can deserve neither praise nor blame on account of their works, what difference will there be in the resurrection

² *Quæstio lvi.*, printed with Justin Martyr's Works.

between those who have been baptized by others and have done nothing, (nothing either good or bad,) and those who have not been baptized, and, in like manner, have done neither good or evil?"

The answer is:—

"The difference between those who are and those who are not baptized is this, that they who are baptized partake of the benefits of Baptism, whereas they who are not baptized do not partake of them. But they are deemed meet to partake of these benefits through the faith of those who offer them to Baptism."

These words afford no ground for supposing that infants were thought to lose the benefits of Baptism through lack of faith in their parents or sponsors; nor does this principle receive any countenance from Augustine's words, quoted in p. 298. For infants were considered as being offered to Baptism, not merely on the faith of their parents and other sponsors, but on that of the whole Church: and it was (to use Mr. Faber's words) *a ruled case*, that a want of faith in those who presented them for Baptism and acted as their sponsors, was no bar to the benefits of Baptism.

Thus, in his Epistle to Bonifacius, Augustine says³, in answer to the question put to him:—

³ This passage is quoted by Wall, *Infant Baptism*, Part I. c. 15. I have followed Wall's translation of it, with the exception of a few words.

“Let not that disturb you, that some people do not bring their infants to Baptism with that faith (or purpose) that they may, by spiritual grace, be regenerated to eternal life, but because they think they do preserve or procure their bodily health by this remedy. For the children do not therefore fail of being regenerated, because they are not brought by those other persons with this intention.—For infants are offered for the recovery of spiritual grace, not so much by those in whose hands they are carried, (though by them, too, if they be good and faithful Christians,) as by the whole society of saints and faithful men. For they are rightly said to be offered by all those whose desire it is that they should be offered; and by whose holy and undivided charity they are assisted towards obtaining the communion of the Holy Spirit (or ‘towards having the Holy Spirit communicated to them’).”

On this passage Wall makes this just remark:—

“Neither did the Baptism (*i. e.* the beneficial effects of Baptism) depend on the holiness, or right faith, or intention of those that brought the child. But it was supposed to be done by the order, and at the desire of the Church, and particularly of those who assisted with their prayers at the offices.”

On the remaining quotations here made from Augustine, it is needless to make any observations. They are irrelevant; and their supposed relevancy

depends on principles, the unsoundness of which has been sufficiently pointed out. On the quotation from his Homilies on the first Epistle of St. John, I have spoken in another place.

Mr. Faber is equally mistaken in another matter in which Augustine is concerned. He allows that with the (imaginary) exception just mentioned, (the case of infants losing the benefits of Baptism through lack of faith in their sponsors,) Augustine invariably taught the concomitancy of Regeneration and infant Baptism. But he contends that by Regeneration that father means not any spiritual or internal change, but only a relative change of federal state. I have already observed that no such notion was entertained by the fathers, who always considered the change wrought in Baptism as a work of the Spirit, and a real change wrought in the inward state of the recipient. The very fact, that they believed that original sin was forgiven and washed away in Baptism, and that they alleged the custom of Infant Baptism in proof of the existence of original sin, is a sufficient intimation that they did not confine its benefits to a mere relative change of state. Such a notion as that of sin forgiven without any internal and spiritual action upon the soul, never entered into their minds. Stronger language in confutation of this misconception of Augustine's doctrine can scarcely be imagined, than that which Mr. Faber has adduced in support of it. For instance, when prov-

ing against the Pelagians the doctrine of original sin, from the fact, allowed by them, that infants are born again in Baptism, he says:—

“As the Spirit of Christ *regenerates* them as believers,” or, ‘into the number of the faithful,’ “so the body of death in Adam had generated them as sinners. For the one is a carnal, the other a spiritual generation: the one makes children of the flesh, the other children of the Spirit: the one children of death, the other children of the resurrection: the one children of wrath, the other children of mercy: and thus the one leaves them under the load of original sin, the other sets them free from the chain of all sin ⁴.”

Again: “Let Adam,” he says, “be recognized in those little ones who are born but not yet baptized; Christ in those who are born and baptized, and therefore born again ⁵.”

Again: “Behold infants, as far as regards their own works, are innocent, having nothing in them but what they have derived from their first parents, who nevertheless stand in need of Baptism, (*i. e.* of the grace conferred in Baptism,) that they who are dead in Adam may be made alive in Christ; that they who are by generation defiled, may be cleansed by Regeneration ⁶.”

⁴ Augustine, de Pecc. Mer. et Remissione, l. iii. c. 2.

⁵ Augustine, de Verb. Apos. Sermon. viii. c. 8.

⁶ Augustine, de Verbis Apost. Sermon. vii. c. 6.

In the passage which I have cited from the Epistle to Bonifacius, he tells us, "that infants are brought to Baptism that they may by spiritual grace be regenerated to eternal life," and that the Holy Spirit is communicated to them in Baptism.

In the Epistle to Dardanus, likewise quoted by Wall, he says:—

"It is a wonderful thing to consider how God dwells in some that know Him not, and in some that know Him He does not dwell. For they who when they know God glorify Him not as God, neither are thankful, do not belong to his temple; and infants sanctified by the sacrament of Christ, being regenerated by the Holy Spirit, do belong to it. We affirm, then, that the Holy Spirit dwells in baptized infants though they know it not. For after the same manner that they know Him not, they know not their own mind: whose reasoning faculty within them, which they cannot yet make use of, is like a spark lulled to rest (or smothered), to be kindled as age advances⁷."

Mr. Arnold quotes another passage to the same effect:—

"But little children have committed no sin of their own in their life. There remains, therefore, original sin, by reason of which they are captives under the power of the devil, unless they

⁷ Augustine, Dardan. Epist. 57.

are released from this captivity by the laver of Regeneration and the blood of Christ, and pass into the kingdom of the Redeemer; the power of him who held them captive being frustrated, and *a power being given them*, by which, from the sons of the world, they may become the sons of God ⁸.”

Another passage must be cited from the writings of this father, which not only disproves Mr. Faber's assertion, but shows what his opinion was (and, we may safely add, what was the opinion of the Church in his days,) of the nature of the grace bestowed in Baptism, and particularly in Infant Baptism. Contending against the Pelagians that original sin does not consist in the following or imitation of Adam, after granting that they who sin voluntarily follow Adam's example, he says:—

“But that which is an example to those who sin voluntarily, is one thing, that which is the origin (*origo*, the principle of inborn sinfulness) of them who are born with sin cleaving to them, is another. For the saints, too, imitate Christ in following his righteousness. Whence the same Apostle says, *Be ye followers* (*μιμηταὶ* imitators) *of me, as I am of Christ* ⁹. But, besides this imitation, his grace works in us our illumination and justification through that operation of which his same preacher (or, the same preacher of Christ) says, *So neither is he that planteth*

⁸ Augustine, de Nuptiis et Concupiscentiâ, l. i. c. 22.

⁹ 1 Cor. xi. 1.

anything, nor he that watereth, but God that giveth the increase ¹⁰. For this grace grafts into his body even those infants who are baptized, who-as yet certainly are not able to imitate any one. As, therefore, he in whom all shall be made alive, besides giving Himself as an example of righteousness to those who imitate Him, bestows also on the faithful the most hidden grace of his Spirit, which He also pours into those little ones in a secret and concealed manner (latenter), so likewise he in whom all die, besides having given an example for imitation to those who transgress the Lord's commandment voluntarily, has also infected all who spring from his root with the hidden infection of carnal concupiscence ¹."

It must be observed that Augustine, in order to refute his opponents who denied the doctrine of original sin, is here arguing from acknowledged principles, from doctrines received and maintained by the whole Church; from the secret and mysterious nature and operations of the grace infused into infants in Baptism, (as was held by the Pelagians, as well as by the Orthodox,) to the equally secret and mysterious nature and operation of the infection derived down to us from Adam.

Many other passages of this father might, I have no doubt, be easily adduced, directly opposed to Mr.

¹⁰ 1 Cor. iii. 7.

¹ Augustine, de Peccat. Meritis, et Remissione, l. i. c. 9., the latter part of this passage is quoted in the treatise, p. 125.

Faber's assertion. But it is fully confuted, even by passages which he has cited in its support, and which I have inserted in these "Remarks."

If Mr. Faber had not viewed this question through a false medium, he might have learned from these passages that Augustine does not consider the Regeneration of an infant in Baptism as merely a relative change of federal condition, and that he does not identify Regeneration with repentance, conversion of the heart, and such other spiritual acts or qualities as imply, together with the grace of the Holy Spirit, choice, and consciousness, and self-action.

In his fourth book, Mr. Faber gives a statement of what he conceives to be the doctrine of the Church of England, concerning Regeneration.

My views of our Church's doctrine having been already given, and the opinions which Mr. Faber advocates, discussed in this treatise, I shall not have occasion to make many remarks on this part of his volume.

I agree with Mr. Faber, that "the resemblance of the Anglican to the primitive doctrine, is in every particular so perfect, that no one who knows how to value the judgment of the early Apostolic Church, could wish that the baptismal offices, and other allied documents of the Church, should ever be made to experience the officious hand of ignorant and unskilful innovation²." But since my view of

² B. iv. c. 1, p. 328.

the primitive doctrine of Regeneration differs materially from Mr. Faber's, we shall of course differ in assigning the features in which this perfect resemblance consists.

Mr. Faber contemplates the declarations contained in our baptismal offices, not as announcements of the judgment and faith of the Church, setting forth to the congregation a fact, humanly speaking, unquestionable, and a great and comfortable truth, but as *technical, official, generic* declarations.

The Church, he tells us, after having received an answer to the legitimate interrogatories, charitably hopes that the answer given, is "the answer of a good conscience toward God;" and, therefore, pronounces the baptized person regenerate *generically*, but not *specifically*. (Note L.)

He adds, somewhat hastily, that the Church will neither baptize, nor undertake to pronounce a person regenerate, without a satisfactory reply to these interrogatories.

Here he forgets that the Church in certain cases allows Private Baptism without the intervention of these interrogatories; and that when infants who have been privately baptized, are received into the Church, they are declared to be regenerate before these interrogatories are put to the sponsors.

"I certify that in this case all is well done and in due order, concerning the baptizing of *this child*, who being born in original sin, and in the wrath of God,

is now *by the laver of Regeneration in Baptism, received into the number of the children of God.*"

"Give thy Holy Spirit to this infant, that he *being (i. e. having been) born again, and being made an heir of everlasting salvation, through our Lord Jesus Christ, may continue thy servant, and attain thy promise* ³."

The fact is, that though the use of such interrogatories may be traced to a very early age of the Christian Church, they form no part of the substance of the sacrament. Repentance and faith are required of persons to be baptized; and the Church would naturally take proper steps for inquiring into the qualifications of adult candidates for Baptism. But questions thus put, and answered in the face of the Church, were an obvious method of ascertaining their mind, and giving publicity to their resolutions. It was a method likewise, well calculated both to edify the congregation, and to make a lasting impression on the recipients themselves; and it was a security given to the Church for their good behaviour and further advancement in righteousness.

One of the principal reasons for putting these questions to the sponsors, as the representatives and

³ See the Form for the Private Baptism of Infants.

In the Office for Public Baptism, where this prayer is used before the infant is baptized, we pray that *he may be born again*; here, where the infant has been baptized, we pray that he *being, or having been, born again, may continue God's servant.*

guardians of infants, seems to be, that it is a security given to the Church, that the child offered for Baptism shall be instructed in the nature of the covenant in which he is concluded, and brought up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord.

The very forms, however, used in the ministration of Baptism, and the whole structure of the services, exclude Mr. Faber's hypothesis of the *systematic official adoption of what he calls generic, as opposed to specific phraseology*. Every thing here done is *specific*, or, more properly speaking, particular. It is restrained and limited to the individuals presented at the font.—We pray, before they are baptized, that these persons *may be born again*; we declare, after they have been baptized, that they *are regenerate*. It would be a solemn mockery to use language so precise and particular, if the fact announced, and the true meaning of the declaration, depended on the future behaviour of these persons; and amounted to no more than a vague and general assertion, which might or might not be verified in the parties concerned.

In this case, the declaration made corresponds with that used in absolving a penitent. Like that, there is nothing in it *generic* (using that word, in what appears to be Mr. Faber's usage of it). It is applied, like the form of absolution, specifically and particularly to individuals. The professions of the adult catechumen, and of the person seeking absolu-

tion, may be hollow and insincere; but that is an affair between them and God who searches the heart. If we are satisfied of their sincerity after due inquiry and examination, we have no right to speak doubtfully. And we do not make use of *official* phraseology or *charitative* language, but declare the faith and doctrine of the Church, when we pronounce the one absolved from his sins, and the other regenerate.

Mr. Faber,—reverting to the opinion avowed by him in the preceeding book, that original sin is an obstacle to the reception of the grace of Baptism; and, in consequence, that as faith and repentance are required of adults, so something analogous to faith and repentance is required of infants, to qualify them for Baptism,—affirms that the denial of such a *prevenient act* necessarily leads to gross Pelagianism.

If so, Augustine and the other fathers who combated the errors of Pelagius fell unawares into the very heresy which they were strenuously opposing. For though they did not deny in terms an opinion which never entered into their thoughts, what they have said relative to infant Baptism in the course of that controversy, virtually denies it. And it must be remembered, that the question of Infant Baptism is handled at large in Augustine's writings against that heresy. The Pelagians denied the doctrine of original sin, but professed to believe that infants receive forgiveness of sin, and are born again in Bap-

tism. Augustine, on the other hand, contended that the baptizing of infants for the remission of sin, was a proof of the existence of original sin, because they could not have been guilty of actual sin. He likewise speaks again and again of infants not being capable of such acts as believing and repenting, and maintains that the sacrament of faith (*i. e.* Baptism) supplies their want of actual faith. But if he had known of any such qualification for their Baptism as Mr. Faber imagines, he would not have looked merely to the sacrament for the remedy of this defect, but to the *prevenient act* which prepares infants for its right reception.

Our own Church, too, if Mr. Faber's assertion is well-grounded, must fall, I fear, under the same heavy charge of Pelagianism. For she holds no such opinion, as that propounded by Mr. Faber, but regards the case of baptized infants in a very different light. After it has been stated in our catechism, that "repentance whereby they forsake sin, and faith whereby they stedfastly believe the promises of God made to them in that sacrament," are required of persons to be baptized; the question is asked, "Why then are infants baptized, when by reason of their tender years they cannot perform them?" in other words, are incapable of repenting and believing? and the answer is, "Because they promise them both by their sureties, which promise, when they come to age, themselves are bound to perform."

Thus, in the judgment of our Church, infants are baptized; not because they are presumed to have experienced a *prevenient act*, analogous to faith and repentance, but because their sureties have promised them in their name and behalf; giving this kind of security to the Church, that they shall be so instructed and brought up, that when they come to age, they shall themselves perform this promise, by professing the faith and practising the repentance that have been promised for them.

But if Mr. Faber's opinions are the real doctrine of the Church; it follows, by necessary consequence, that in the Church's judgment, Baptism is not a means, or instrument, or channel; but, as the followers of Zuinglius and Calvin held, a sign only of Regeneration. It is agreed on all hands, that adults cannot partake of the grace, whatever it may be, of this sacrament, without faith and repentance; but according to Mr. Faber, repentance and Regeneration are identical; therefore, every regenerate adult is born again before Baptism. So likewise, according to Mr. Faber, infants must have repentance, *according to the measure of the recipient*, something that is analogous to repentance, previous to Baptism; and therefore must have Regeneration *pro modo recipientis*, or something analogous to Regeneration before Baptism. Consequently, since both regenerate adults and regenerate infants are regenerated, according to the measure of the recipient, before Baptism, neither

one nor the other can be born again in or through Baptism.

I will not ask how far Mr. Faber is consistent with himself, or perceives the consequences of his own positions, when, on the one hand, he identifies repentance and Regeneration; and, on the other hand, states that Baptism is one channel of Regeneration, and classes himself among the advocates of the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. But I will ask whether any one, who will read our Liturgy and Articles in a plain straightforward manner, can persuade himself that these positions of Mr. Faber are the doctrines taught by the Church of England?

Mr. Faber, indeed, contends that the Church of England, like the early Church, to whose testimony he has appealed, though systematically adopting a *generic* phraseology, saw the danger of her purely *generic phraseology* being interpreted *specifically*, and thence, in like manner, resorted to limitation and explanation.

But these explanations and limitations, as Mr. Faber chooses to call them, have no bearing on the question of *generic* and *specific* language, nor is there reason to suppose that they were intended to meet any such danger as he imagines. They merely announce a truth that was always taught by the primitive Christians, and seems obvious to common sense; that Baptism, like all Divine ordinances, is a means of grace and salvation only, when "rightly (or

worthily) received⁴." The words of the 27th Article, rightly received, allude in all probability to certain erroneous tenets of the schoolmen and the Church of Rome. But they are not intended to convert the solemn and authoritative language of our Liturgy into a *technical* and *generic* phraseology. Nor do they mean to assert that infants do not receive the sacrament of Baptism rightly or worthily, unless prepared for its reception by such a *prevenient act* as Mr. Faber deems, in their case, absolutely necessary.

On Mr. Faber's comment on the passage of our Catechism which defines a sacrament to be "an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given to us, ordained by Christ Himself as a means whereby we receive the same," which he alleges as another example of the limitation and explanation of generic language,—I shall make no remark. Mr. Arnold has shown how entirely groundless this distinction is between *a means* and *the means*; and I must express my surprise that Mr. Faber should have condescended to resort to such an argument.

After all that has been said, it is scarcely necessary to remind the reader, that the prayers that God will grant us the true circumcision of the Spirit, and that He will create and make in us new and contrite hearts, are not prayers for Regeneration, but

⁴ Article XXVth.

are offered up by and for persons, each and all of whom the Church has declared regenerate, and believes to have been born again of water and of the Spirit. They are prayers not for Regeneration, but for grace and strength to mortify our hearts and members from all worldly and carnal lusts, and for that contrition and change of heart of which every regenerate person stands more or less in need. They serve to remind us of our sinful state, and of our need of spiritual aid to enable us to get the better of the "infection of nature" remaining in us. But they are not intended to explain or limit any supposed *generic* phraseology in what Mr. Faber calls the Church's *official and technical declarations*.

In the passage quoted from the Homily on Whitsunday, though taken from a popular discourse, in which accuracy of statement and illustration are scarcely to be looked for, the distinction between the new birth of the Spirit, and his abiding and renovating influences, is laid down with sufficient plainness and precision. And it then calls upon us to learn from the actual state of our inward dispositions and outward conduct, not whether we have or have not been born again of the Spirit, but whether the Holy Ghost is *abiding* in us.

"Neither doth He think it sufficient inwardly to work the spiritual new birth of man, unless He do also dwell and abide in him."

"O! but how shall I know that the Holy Ghost

is within me? Forsooth, as the tree is known by its fruits, so is the Holy Ghost."

"Here, then, is the glass wherein thou must behold thyself, and discern whether thou have the Holy Ghost within thee, or the spirit of the flesh⁴."

Agreeing with Mr. Faber that our "baptismal offices and other allied documents ought not to be tampered with or altered," I likewise think that these offices, if allowed to speak for themselves, present us with a correct and faithful representation of the scriptural and primitive doctrine of Regeneration. They establish, as plainly as language can, the distinction between Regeneration and those spiritual graces, which, viewed in another light, are religious duties, and have been classed, (using the word in a secondary and restricted sense,) under the general term—renovation. Explained on Mr. Faber's principles, they resemble what are called legal fictions; and lead us to suspect that their compilers, and the Church that has adopted them, had thought that a main use of language is to enable us to disguise our sentiments. Indeed, the phrases to which Mr. Faber has had recourse in delivering his judgment on this topic, *technical phraseology, generic language, technical and official declarations*, seem to subject both the fathers and the Church to a charge of this kind;

⁴ See the Treatise, c. vi. p. 110, 111; and Archbishop Laurence, Doctrine, part i. c. 6.

and if he had not seen the question through a discoloured medium, might have led him to suspect the soundness of his theory.

I am constrained to avow my opinion, that what he calls *technical* and *generic*, is inartificial, undisguised, and specific language; that what he calls *official declarations*, exhibits a faithful representation of the doctrine and belief of the Church; that what he calls the *paradoxes and speculations* of certain modern divines, is, in fact, *primitive doctrine*, and that what he calls *primitive doctrine*, is made up, in substance, of the *paradoxes and speculations* of a comparatively modern school of theology, the school of Zuinglius and Calvin and their followers.

Nearly twenty-three years have passed since the first edition of the *General View, &c.* was published; and from that time to this I have left it to itself, without defending the opinions maintained in it, or entering further into the controversy. But as a fourth Edition is now going to the press, I have felt myself called on, and I have obeyed the call very reluctantly, to make these remarks on Mr. Faber's volume, not for the sake of disputation, but out of regard to what I conceive to be the truth. I trust that nothing will be found in these pages inconsistent with the respect due to Mr. Faber, with fair and dispassionate controversy, and with the laws of Christian charity.

Feeling, as I very sincerely do, a high respect for

Mr. Faber, I regret that he has come forward as the advocate of such a system. My knowledge too of the regard and respect, and, I may add, the reverence which his great talents, his unwearied industry, his extensive acquirements, his professional character, and his private worth have earned for him, makes me fear that the opinions which he has advanced on this subject, will carry with them a degree of weight which they would not have obtained had they proceeded from a person less honoured and respected.

Mr. Faber has persuaded himself, and would fain persuade his readers, that there are no Clergymen of our Church who do not hold the doctrine of Baptismal Regeneration. I will not here inquire how far the system which he has advocated has a claim to that appellation. But within the last two or three years, I have seen more than one pamphlet, bearing the names of Clergymen, in the title-pages of which it is deliberately announced that Baptismal Regeneration is *not* the doctrine of the Church of England. I have read, too, in a periodical, an extract from a publication of a London Clergyman, in which he affirms that no *serious Christian* believes this doctrine.

My attention has been lately drawn to the title pages of two publications, written by a beneficed Clergyman, who acknowledges that Baptismal Regeneration is the doctrine of the Church of England, but at the same time denounces it as unscriptural.

These title-pages are, "Baptismal Regeneration Satan's Second Lie," and "A Minister's Plea for remaining in connexion with the Church of England, whilst openly protesting against that which is unscriptural in her practice and her principles."

Another extraordinary case bearing upon this question has been just now brought to my knowledge⁵.

In a publication called the *Children's Friend*, the author, a respectable Clergyman of our Church, when describing the happy death of a child of four years of age, says:—

"Early was he devoted to God in the name of his holy Child, Jesus. The water which set him apart from the world, and admitted him into the Church of the first-born, was laid upon his unconscious brow by his father's hand."

"The baptismal rite he had understood in its full meaning, and it freed his soul from every lingering desire, every trembling fear. It taught him self-surrender. It bowed his young heart to the will of God. It bade him ascend on the wings of a willing spirit to the bosom of the Father. It pledged to him the ever-seeing, all-surrounding love of a covenant-keeping God, in the world of light, and glory, and joy."

For this passage he is called to an account in the

⁵ Irish Ecclesiastical Journal, Oct. 29, 1844.

columns of a newspaper. But instead of either silently disclaiming the jurisdiction of this tribunal, or defending himself on the ground that he had said nothing but what is agreeable to the teaching of his own Church, and of the Church Universal from the time of the Apostles, and what, if Infant Baptism is, as he himself professes, most agreeable to the institution of Christ, is a legitimate conclusion from Christ's own words; he pleads guilty to the indictment, and quails before this arbiter of sound doctrine.

He informs the editor, that "the passage as it stands is calculated to convey the impression that he had changed his long-avowed sentiments on essential points of religion, and drank in the mischievous spirit of the day. I thank," he proceeds, "and bless God, that I have never for a moment been shaken in my religious views, or tempted in the least degree to think that we may turn with profit to the Tractarian party for amendment in our sentiments and practice in any way whatever. I truly believe that Tractarianism is the work of him who is mysteriously permitted to transform himself into an angel of light, and that it comes as the saddest and most fearful blow to the best interests of true religion that has been known, in my days, at least."

What the opinions which the writer is so eager to retract have to do with Tractarianism, I do not understand, unless he is anxious to exonerate him-

self from the suspicion of any lurking belief of the doctrine of Regeneration in and through Baptism. But I do know that it has become a fashion with some religionists to brand with the name of Tractarianism, every doctrinal statement and every practice which differ from their own system. It may not have been judicious to speak of a child of four years old as understanding the rite of Baptism in its full meaning. But the language with which he seems to reproach himself, coincides with that of the Church whose Minister he is, when it teaches us "that it is certain, by God's word, that children who are baptized and die before they commit actual sin, (and such a child as the one described in these paragraphs can scarcely be supposed to have sinned a sin unto death,) are undoubtedly saved;" or, as the Homily on Salvation expresses the same universally received opinion, "Insomuch that infants, *being baptized* and dying in their infancy, are by this sacrifice⁶ washed from their sins, brought to God's favour and made his children, and inheritors of his Kingdom of Heaven."

A word respecting Tractarianism. It would be well if those who talk so glibly of Tractarianism, and brand with that name whatever either in practice or doctrine happens to differ from their own views, would remember, that as every thing taught by those

⁶ i. e. the sacrifice of Christ.

who acknowledge the Pope's supremacy is not Popery, and every thing taught by Calvinists is not Calvinism, so every thing taught by Tractarians is not Tractarianism. Those truths which they have learned from the teaching and testimony of our own and of the Universal Church, and from the best and worthiest of our Divines, and have defended against misrepresentations and innovations, do not lose any of their value from the errors into which they, or at least more than one of them, have fallen, and the devious course which they have pursued in other matters. If the doctrine which this gentleman seems so anxious to disclaim is Tractarian, I must avow myself to have been a Tractarian, I will not say before the known writers of these Tracts were born, but, at all events, when they were children or school-boys.

The advocates of the Zuinglian and Calvinian system have usually denied the doctrine of Regeneration in Baptism, on the ground of its being unscriptural; not in accordance, that is, with their own views and interpretation of Scripture. Some of them, too, have at different times undertaken to vindicate our own Church from the imputation of holding that doctrine. But they have usually disclaimed all reference to the writings of the fathers, as having no weight or authority in the decision of the question. Mr. Faber, however, who knows what kind of authority is due to their testimony, produces

them as his witnesses, and undertakes to prove that their opinions on this question are in accordance with his own. But the medium through which he has viewed their writings is manifestly the system which he had adopted, before he began to collect their evidence; and his conclusions, whatever appearance they may present of logical deduction, are, if I mistake not, altogether erroneous, because grounded throughout on untenable premises.

For the terms which he affirms to be synonymous with Regeneration, have in fact a very different meaning in the writings of the fathers of the four first centuries, denoting states of mind, qualities, &c., distinct from Regeneration, in both fact and theory. For instance, there are four passages, or at the utmost five; two of them occurring in the writings of Clemens Alexandrinus, where repentance is called, manifestly in an improper and analogical sense, Regeneration. But in all other parts of their works, Regeneration either signifies the inward grace of Baptism or the whole sacrament, the outward sign and the inward grace combined and united. So familiar, indeed, is this language to them, that Regeneration and Baptism are used as convertible terms; and in their view of the question, to be baptized, was to be born again; to be born again was to be baptized; a way of speaking which evidently supposes the concurrence and joint operation of the outward sign and the inward grace. Mr. Faber,

however, has endeavoured to invalidate the conclusiveness of this induction, and to convert those writers into witnesses on his own behalf by a sort of logical Alchymy⁶, which by transmuting the sense of words at its pleasure, arrives at conclusions satisfactory to the writer, and to those readers who wish to be satisfied; and calculated to bewilder and mislead those who do not perceive the precarious and untenable nature of the premises on which those conclusions depend.

Mr. Faber has entered as little into the views of the persons whose opinions he supposes himself to be controverting, as into those of the witnesses whom he cites. No small portion, therefore, of his arguments and citations is irrelevant to the real question. He has perplexed that question, by substituting the term *Moral* for that of *spiritual Regeneration*. He has stated, what is in fact contradicted by the very passages which he quotes, that it was a *ruled case* with the primitive Christians, that Baptism and Circumcision, and Regeneration and the Circumcision of the heart are identical, and that Regeneration is identical with Repentance and conversion; that it is conveyed, in the ordinary course of God's dispensations through three *separate and distinct* instruments or channels, and takes place, as it may happen, either before, or at, or after, or without Baptism; and that

⁶ Hooker's E. P. l. v. 59.

all baptized infants are not born again of water and of the Spirit, but such only as give evidence of their having been born again by their future conduct.

Those principles were, I believe, maintained by Mr. Faber, long before he thought of citing the fathers as witnesses. He allows, indeed, Baptism to be in some sense a means of Regeneration; but in all other respects his opinions coincide with those of the Zuinglian and Calvinian school of theology. But I am not acquainted with any former writer, who has undertaken to trace up these opinions to the Christian writers of the four first centuries.

Some principles he has likewise found in their writings, which have hitherto, I believe, remained undiscovered. For instance, that their *ideality* of Baptism, implies what, as he tells us, Cyprian has not scrupled to call a *double sacrament*; a sacrament of water, and a sacrament of the Spirit: that the primitive Christians associated Regeneration with the rite of Baptism, because they could not assign the precise time when it took place; that the saving effects of Infant Baptism depended, in their opinion, on the sincerity of the sponsors: that they too made use of what he calls a *generic* language; and that in their penitential discipline, they put the mildest construction on the case of the penitents, contemplating them as having lapsed from a state of grace, rather than as having not been born again.

Mr. Faber is undoubtedly at liberty to put what construction he pleases on writers to whom we attribute no other authority than what is due to them on the grounds of sound reason and judicious criticism. But the case is widely different when he undertakes to apply the same or similar principles to the interpretation of the formularies of our own Church. In the Treatise itself, I have dwelt at some length on the danger of tampering with the plain language of these documents; and I wish I could say that the remarks which I then made are inapplicable to Mr. Faber's volume.

When I find the plain and decisive language of our Baptismal Offices resolved into *technical phraseology*, *generic language*, and *official declarations*, I will ask one simple question. When the Church, having previously prayed that the person to be baptized may be born again, and receive remission of his sins by spiritual Regeneration, as soon as he has been baptized declares, in a solemn and public manner, by the mouth of her Minister, that he is regenerate and grafted into the body of Christ, and gives hearty thanks to God that He has been pleased to regenerate him with his Holy Spirit, is she disguising her real sentiments under the veil of a technical and official phraseology, or speaking the truth in love?

NOTES.

[A.]

I SELECT a few passages from the treatise, which show that I consider this change as something very different from a merely relative change of condition.

“Sometimes it (Regeneration) signifies the inward grace in its most comprehensive sense. Sometimes that part of it only which consists of a principle of new life.”

“The grant and earnest of the Holy Ghost as a principle of new life.”

“A determinate change of spiritual and religious condition.”

“In Baptism they are made partakers of a principle of new life.”

“In Baptism every convert was sanctified by a special gift of the Spirit.”

“The initiatory gift or earnest of the Spirit.”

“The spiritual life commenced mysteriously in the sacrament.”

“Conveying over to us our spiritual nativity, pardon of sin, and the mysterious earnest of the Holy Ghost.”

“Signs accompanied with a conveyance of grace, and a saving efficacy upon the soul.”

“The gift of the Holy Ghost as a principle of a new life of righteousness.”

“Regeneration uniformly signifies a spiritual change, the gift, or earnest, or covenanted consignment of the Holy Ghost.”

"The earnest of the Spirit and the infusion of the divine virtue of the Holy Ghost."

"The covenanted grant and infused virtue of the Holy Ghost."

"Infants are endowed with this infused virtue and mysterious earnest of the Holy Ghost."

"In infants the Spirit of grace, which is designed to be a principle of new life, is a *potential principle*" (the very term which Mr. Arnold, who seems not to have read my book, uses).

"A supernatural and remedial principle."

[B.]

The Primitive Christians, when they spoke of martyrs as being baptized with blood, had an eye, in all probability, to our Lord's conversation with the Apostles, John and James and their mother. (Matthew xx. 20, &c.) "Are ye able to drink the cup that I shall drink? or to be baptized with the Baptism that I am baptized with." "Ye shall drink indeed of my cup, and be baptized with the Baptism that I am baptized with."

[C.]

Mr. Faber, adopting the opinion of divines of the Zuinglian and Calvinian School, asserts that Circumcision under the Legal, and Baptism under the Evangelical dispensation, are one and the same sacrament; and this, he adds, was a *ruled case* with the primitive Christians. And he contends that Regeneration and the Circumcision of the heart, being the inward graces of these sacraments, are likewise identical. I have already stated that the witnesses whom he cites, give evidence against him, affirming Circumcision to be a type only, or figure of Baptism¹. But there

¹ Chrysostom takes a far narrower view of Circumcision, considering it merely as a mark of difference.

"But consider, I pray you, God's love and good-will towards man, and his ineffable beneficence to us. For in their case (i. e. the case of the Jews), what was done was attended with pain and suffering, and no other advantage attended on Circumcision, except that they were by it distinguished (*γνωρίμους*, discernible) and separated from the rest of the nations. But

is nothing in Scripture which gives any countenance to the notion that these ordinances are identical, and not, as was always understood to be the case, analogous.

There is no mention in Scripture of Circumcision having been ordained as an outward and visible sign of an inward and spiritual grace given to the circumcised. It was an initiatory rite through which the Israelites were made partakers of God's old covenant, and stamped as his peculiar people, separated from the idolatrous tribes and nations of the earth. It was a sign or memorial, both of the obedience which they owed Him, and of the blessings which He promised them as its reward. But it is never spoken of as the channel of any spiritual grace communicated through it to the human soul. It was appropriated to males only ; consequently, had it been ordained as a means of grace, one-half of the nation would have been excluded from the benefits of it. It assured to them likewise, on God's part, the fulfilment of the promises which He had made to their Church and nation, including doubtless, though under the veil of mysterious and unaccomplished prophecy, the promise given to Abraham, that in his seed all the families of the earth should be blessed.

But Mr. Faber contends that Circumcision and Baptism are identical, because they have the *same moral import*. It is not, perhaps, correct to say that they have the *same* moral import ; though it will readily be allowed that their moral import, (the moral and religious lessons, that is, which have been grounded on them,) is similar. But the moral import of religious ordinances,

our Circumcision, I mean the grace of Baptism, has a remedy free from pain, and procures us ten thousand blessings, and fills us with the grace of the Holy Ghost." Chry. Hom. 40 in Genesin. He speaks in the same strain in his homily on the 17th Chapter of Genesis.

Ἄλλὰ σκόπει μοι, ἀγαπητοί, τοῦ Θεοῦ τὴν φιланθρωπίαν, καὶ τὴν ἄφατον εἰς ἡμᾶς ἐνεργεσίαν· ἐκεῖ γὰρ ὁδὺν καὶ πόνον ἐκ τοῦ γενομένου, καὶ οὐδὲν ἕτερον ἐκ τῆς περιτομῆς ὄφελος ἦν ἢ τοῦτο μόνον, τὸ διὰ τοῦ σημείου τούτου γνωρίμους αὐτοὺς εἶναι καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν ἐθνῶν κεχωρισθαι. Ἡ δὲ ἡμετέρα περιτομή, ἢ τοῦ βαπτίσματος λέγω χάρις, ἀνώδυνον ἔχει τὴν ἰατρείαν, καὶ μυρίων ἀγαθῶν πρόξενος γίνεται, καὶ τῆς τοῦ Πνεύματος ἡμᾶς ἐμπίπλῃσι χάριτος.—Chrys. Hom. 40 in Genesin.

whether sacramental or not, and the inward grace of a sacrament, are things perfectly distinct. The moral import means the precepts which are grafted on them, and the moral and religious duties to which they oblige us, implying always a promise of grace to help us in fulfilling them. The inward grace is the gift of God, bestowed on us freely through the channel of a visible sacrament—in Baptism, for example, the grace of the Holy Spirit as a principle of mortification and new life—in other words, a death to sin and a new birth to righteousness.

The moral import of an ordinance, is the applying of it to some moral or spiritual purpose, through the medium of some analogy, some partial or imaginary resemblance, between the outward rite and the duty prescribed. Thus, in allusion to the washings and purifications required by the law of Moses, the Prophet commanded the Israelites to wash and make themselves clean; and on the other hand, God promises that He will cleanse and wash them, and sprinkle them with clean water, (language which contains a promise of the preventing and sanctifying influences of the Holy Ghost), and in their turn, God's worshippers beseech Him to wash them, that they may be clean.

St. Paul makes use of the same figurative adaptation of an ordinance to a moral purpose, when he exhorts the Corinthians to "purge out from among them the old leaven, that they might be a new lump:" and to keep "the feast of Christ their passover, sacrificed for them, not with the old leaven, the leaven of malice and wickedness; but with the unleavened bread of sincerity and truth." In like manner, Moses gives a moral turn to the rite of Circumcision, calling on the people to "circumcise the foreskin of their hearts;" and on the other hand, God promises to "circumcise their hearts,"—examples of that correspondence between grace promised, and duties performed, which pervades the volume of the Scriptures. Similar lessons are grounded on the ordinance of Baptism; the analogy between physical and moral purification being obvious, and, so to speak, natural.

But the inward and spiritual graces of the two sacraments—the death unto sin, and new birth unto righteousness, of the one, the mystical body and blood of Christ of the other,—are not

duties, but altogether free gifts : requiring indeed suitable qualifications in those who receive them, but in themselves partaking in no respect of the character of duties. Man must wash, and cleanse, and circumcise his own heart ; but he cannot, in any sense, regenerate himself.

It does not, therefore, follow that Circumcision and Baptism are identical, because they have the same, or, more properly speaking, a similar moral import ; and the notion that Regeneration and the Circumcision of the heart are identical, is equally groundless. It has no foundation in Scripture ; it forms no part of the doctrine of those primitive Christians, to whom Mr. Faber appeals ; nor is it, as he has persuaded himself, the doctrine of our own Church.

After having produced what he calls the *official declarations* of our Church, Mr. Faber cites some other passages of our Liturgy, which, in his opinion, were intended to explain and modify her *technical* phraseology, and to prevent our being misled by her *generic* language. For instance, when we pray that God will grant us the true Circumcision of the Spirit, and that He will create and make in us new and contrite hearts ; we, as He assumes, pray for Regeneration, and the Church teaches us to pray for Regeneration. But since the Church considers all her members as having been born again, not *technically and officially*, but really and truly in Baptism ; and it is granted that there can be, strictly speaking, no second new birth, Regeneration and the subject matter, whatever it may be, of these prayers cannot be identical. They are, indeed, distinct, both in theory and in fact. But the church confesses that the infection of nature remains in the regenerate, and knows that all the children whom she has brought forth are more or less sinners. She, therefore, bids us pray for those things of which we have all need ; “the true Circumcision of the Spirit, that our hearts and all our members being mortified from all worldly and carnal lusts, we may in all things obey God’s blessed will ;” and the “creation in us of new and contrite hearts, that we, worthily lamenting our sins and acknowledging our wretchedness, may obtain of the God of all mercy perfect remission and forgiveness.”

Mr. Faber has perplexed the question in debate, by substituting the word "moral" for the word "spiritual" Regeneration; and thus confounding Regeneration with those qualities and operations of the human soul, which are, properly speaking, moral. But at the same time he has expunged the true and primitive doctrine of Regeneration from the list of Christian credenda.

[D.]

Mr. Faber quotes a long passage from Augustin's Tractates, on St. John's Epistles, and infers from it, that in that father's opinion those persons who were living in habits of sin, or were without the grace of love or charity, though they had been baptized with water, had not been baptized with, or born of, the Spirit.

There can, however, be no doubt that Augustine, in common with the Universal Church of those days, believed that with the exception of the cases already mentioned, the inward grace always accompanies the outward and visible sign in Baptism; always in the case of infants. Had he, therefore, on the present occasion, asserted that the spiritual birth necessarily develops itself in a spiritual life, and that none were even born of the Spirit who did not afterwards bring forth the fruits of the Spirit, he would have contradicted himself and the doctrine of the Church as it was taught in its services, and exhibited in its penitential discipline.

It is evident, not only from the tenor of Augustine's writings on this subject, but from the very passage that has been alleged, that it was not his intention to affirm that he who does not possess the grace of charity, had never partaken of the grace of the sacrament, nor that the actual state of his heart and habits of life was the criterion by which it must be judged, whether he had or had not been born again in Baptism. His discourse, like the passage of Scripture on which he is enlarging, is not dogmatical, but practical, and its object is to establish certain tests by which men must judge of their *present* spiritual state, and present relationship to God.

"Behold," he says, the man who has been "baptized has re-

ceived the sacrament of his new birth. He has the sacrament, a sacrament great, divine, holy, ineffable. Consider what kind of sacrament—such an one as makes a man new by the forgiveness of all his sins. Let him look, however, to his heart, and see whether that which was wrought on his body, has been carried to perfection there. Let him see whether he has charity; if not, he has the mark or seal (characterism), it is true, but has wandered abroad as a runaway from Him, whose mark he bears; and then let him not say, I am born of God. Let him have charity; otherwise, let him not say that he has been born again.”

He then proceeds to reconcile the apparent contradiction of 1 John iii. 9, and i. 8, 9, 10, by assuming that in the former passage, St. John is speaking of a particular sin, viz. the want of charity, and concludes that it is love alone which makes the distinction between the sons of God and the sons of the devil: that they who have charity are born of God; they who have not charity, are not born of God.

“Let not him who offends against charity and brotherly love, say that he is born of God. But there are certain sins which he who is in a state of brotherly love cannot commit; this especially, that he cannot hate his brother. And what is he to do with those other sins, by reason of which it is said, *If we say that we have no sin*, &c. Let him hear his warrant of security in another place of Scripture. *Charity covereth the multitude of sins*. Have what you will, if you have not charity, it will profit you nothing. Though you have nothing else, have this only, and you have fulfilled the law. Whoever offends against this law, is guilty of that heinous sin into which they fall, who are not born of God.”

From this passage, extracted from a popular and practical discourse, it cannot be inferred, with good reason, that in Augustine’s opinion, they who want the grace of charity, have never partaken of the grace of the sacrament. For he speaks of that sacrament of which they did partake, as something *great, holy, divine, ineffable*; terms which he would scarcely have used, had he looked upon it as extending no further, in their case, than to the outward washing; and he speaks of the person who had not charity, as

one who had received the mark or character, but was a deserter or runaway from him, whose mark he bears. What he means is, as he in other places expresses himself, that they who had not charity, had not retained the grace given them in Baptism, by leading a good life in obedience to God's commandments². That the grace then given had not been called into action, and forfeited by exercise and experience; that men must not call themselves children of God, nor boast of being his children, when they have not love, and therefore do not resemble Him who is love³.

This is the same view of the question which the Apostle has taken, in the passage on which Augustine is commenting; and it is equivalent to the answers which have been given to the following question⁴.

"If, according to St. John, he that is born of God does not commit sin, because his word abides in him, and he cannot sin because he is born of God; and if he who has been born of water and of the Spirit, has been born of God, how happens it that we, who have been born of God in Baptism, are nevertheless able to sin?"

This mode of treating the question is analogous, as I have elsewhere observed, to what divines call the tropological interpretation of Scripture, giving it (*i. e.*) a moral turn, or grounding a moral and practical application on its literal sense. St. Paul expresses himself in a like manner, when he says: "*He is not a Jew which is one outwardly, neither is that Circumcision which is outward in the flesh.*" There can be no doubt, that they, of whom he speaks, were Jews, and that the Circumcision of their flesh was Circumcision. But what he asserts is, that while they were not living as Jews were bound to live, and while their hearts were uncircumcised, they could lay no claim to the advantage of being Jews, or the profit of being circumcised. In the same manner our Saviour tells the Jews, that if they had been Abraham's children, they would have done the works of Abraham;

² Cum baptizati fueritis tenete vitam bonam in præceptis Dei, ut Baptismum custodiat is usque ad finem.—*Augustinus ad Catechumenos.*

³ 1 John iv. 8.

⁴ 'Ερώρησις Μαξιμου.—*Catena in Epist. Cath.* p. 125. Oxford, 1840.

thus, denying that they were Abraham's children in a moral and spiritual sense, though He had acknowledged them to be such by natural and lineal descent ⁵.

As, therefore, St. Paul does not mean to affirm, that they of whom he was speaking, were not Jews, and had not been circumcised; and as our Lord does not deny, that the men who were disputing with Him, were the natural descendants of Abraham; so there can be no reasonable doubt that neither St. John nor his commentator intended to assert, that those persons who had fallen into sinful habits, and lost the grace of charity after Baptism, had not been born of God, or born of water and the Spirit, when they were baptized. What they really affirm is, that such persons had not retained the grace then given, and that the seed, *i. e.* the Spirit, was not abiding in them; and that on this account they had no claim to the name, and no right to glory in the name of God's children ⁶.

There is nothing, therefore, in the passages which have been examined, which can, on just principles of interpretation, bring us

⁵ John viii. 37—39.

⁶ St. Augustine supposes that the seed here spoken of, is the word of God. But the explanation of the Greek Commentators gives, I think, the true sense of the phrase σπέρμα Θεοῦ. I shall quote the comment of Severus from the Catena in Epistolas Catholicas, edited by Dr. Cramer, in 1 John iii. 9.

“He speaks not this, as if our nature had undergone such a change, as to have become incapable of sinning, and exempt from passions and infirmities. But because, so far as he who has been born of God retains the grace of his (new) birth by a pure conversion, he cannot sin. And he adds the reason why he cannot sin, because *his seed abides in him*. What then is the seed of God which abides in the faithful? The access, or superinvention (ἐπιφύττις) of the Holy Spirit through which we were born again; which does not depart from us unless by shameful deeds we *grieve the Holy Spirit of God, whereby we have been sealed unto the day of revelation* (ἀποκαλύψεως).”

The printed text in the beginning of this quotation is corrupt. Οὐ τοῦτο εἶπεν ὡς εἰς τὸ ἐπίδεκτον ἀμαρτίας καὶ ἀπαθείας ἡμῶν περιστάσης τῆς φύσεως. I have substituted from Theophylact, Οὐ τοῦτο εἶπεν ὡς εἰς τὸ ἀνεπίδεκτον ἀμαρτίας καὶ εἰς ἀπάθειαν ἡμῶν περιστάσης τῆς φύσεως,—a correction which has been previously suggested by a passage which follows in the same Scholion.

to the conclusion, that it has been taught by St. John, and received as his doctrine by Augustine, that freedom from sin, the exercise of charity, &c. are the criteria by which we are to judge whether any one has or has not been born again in Baptism—in other words, that as a spiritual and holy life is the only evidence of the abiding grace, or indwelling of the Spirit, so it is the only evidence of the spiritual new birth; that they whose lives are holy, whether baptized or not, have been born again; while they whose lives are unholy, though baptized with water, have not been born again of the Spirit.

There is another passage of Scripture (John iii. 7, 8.) which has been often adduced to prove that the question, whether a person has, or has not, been born of the Spirit, can only be decided by looking to the effects that follow; that we must ascertain the presence of the Spirit in the new birth, in the same manner that we are assured of the presence of the wind; *i. e.* by its effects. But this interpretation of the passage appears to me to be both precarious and erroneous, and wide of its real scope. The following comments of Chrysostom and Theophylact express, if I am not mistaken, its true sense and drift.

“For if you cannot explain the onset and course of this wind (πνεύματος) which you perceive by hearing and feeling; why do you inquire curiously about the operation of that Spirit, which is from God, when you do not understand the operation of the wind, (ἀνέμου) though you hear the sound of it?”—*Chrysostom in locum.*

Εἰ γὰρ τούτου τοῦ πνεύματος οὐ τὴν αἴσθησιν δέχῃ τῇ ἀκοῇ καὶ τῇ ἀφ᾽ ἧς τὴν ὁρμὴν ἐρμηνεύσαι οὐκ οἶδας, οὐδὲ τὴν ὁδόν· πῶς τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ Πνεύματος ἐνέργειαν περιεργάζῃ, τὴν τοῦ ἀνέμου οὐκ ἐπιστάμενος καίτοι φωνὴν ἀκούων;—*Chrysostom in locum.*

“He then endeavours to instruct him by an example borrowed from sensible things. For *the wind*, he says, *bloweth where it listeth*. Learn, he says, from the wind (πνεύματος) greater things. For the wind (ἄνεμος) (for this is what he here calls *spirit*) (πνεῦμα) blows where it lists, and you hear the sound of it. Nevertheless, you do not understand the manner in which it is

carried along (its current, *φοράν*): for it cannot be put under restraint nor impeded in its course, but rushes this or that way by a power inherent in it. If, therefore, you are ignorant how or where the wind, that *spirit* which falls under our senses, blows, how is it that you are curiously inquisitive about that Regeneration which is of God? If that Spirit (or wind) cannot be put under restraint, much more is it impossible that the grace of the Holy Spirit should be subject to any natural laws."—*Theophylact in locum.*

Εἶτα ἀπὸ αἰσθητοῦ παραδείγματος πειρᾶται διδάσκειν αὐτόν· τὸ πνεῦμα γάρ, φησιν, ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ· ἀπὸ ἀνέμου, φησὶ, μάνθανε τὰ μείζονα· ὁ γὰρ ἄνεμος, τοῦτον γὰρ ἐνταῦθά φησι πνεῦμα, ὅπου θέλει πνεῖ, καὶ τὸν ἦχον αὐτοῦ ἀκούεις, ἀλλ' ὅμως οὐκ οἶδας τὴν φορὰν αὐτοῦ, ἀκάθεκτος γάρ ἐστι καὶ ἀκώλυτος, καὶ φυσικῇ ἐξουσίᾳ τὴν ὅπουδῆποτε ὁρμὴν ἔχει·—εἰ οὖν τὸν ἄνεμον, τοῦτο δὴ τὸ αἰσθήσει ὑποπίπτον πνεῦμα, ἀγνοεῖς πῶς καὶ ποῦ πνεῖ, πῶς τὴν ἀπὸ τοῦ Θεοῦ ἀναγέννησιν περιεργάζῃ; Εἰ τοῦτο τὸ πνεῦμα οὐ δύναται κατασχηθῆναι, πολλῶ μᾶλλον ἢ τοῦ Ἁγίου Πνεύματος χάρις νόμοις φύσεως οὐχ ὑπενεχθήσεται.—*Theophylact in locum.*

[E.]

Mr. Faber has a long note upon the word Suspension. Those, however, who have employed this term, do not enter into any metaphysical inquiries into the subject. What they mean is, that the spiritual grace which did not attend on Baptism, in consequence of a moral obstacle, when obtained through repentance, must be considered as connected in some mysterious manner with the sacrament which had been formerly administered.

[F.]

That the knowledge of which he is speaking, is not acquired through the ordinary means of instruction, but springs up in the mind in Baptism, is what Clemens Alexandrinus is insisting on from the commencement of this chapter, in which he is answering those persons (Gnostics), who supposed that Christians being called children or babes, implied their being as yet acquiring only the first elements of knowledge.

“Immediately after our Regeneration, (*i. e.* our Baptism,) we received that perfection which we were eager to obtain; for we were enlightened; but this is (in other words) to know (or to acquire a clear knowledge of) God (*ἐπιγινῶναι*). He, therefore, cannot be imperfect who knows that which is perfect.”

Ἀναγεννηθέντες γοῦν εὐθέως τὸ τέλειον ἀπειλήφαμεν οὗ ἕνεκεν ἐσπεύδομεν· ἐφωτίσθημεν γάρ· τοῦτο δὲ ἐστὶ ἐπιγινῶναι τὸν Θεόν· οὐκ οὐκ ἀτελής ὁ ἐγνωκὼς τὸ τέλειον.

He then adduces in proof of this, the example of our Saviour, of whom he says, that in order to form an economical precedent (*οἰκονομικὴν προδιατύπωσιν*), a precedent that is connected with his incarnation and human nature, it was necessary he should be perfectly regenerated.

“Did he then become perfect immediately after being baptized by John? Certainly. Did he then acquire any additional knowledge from John? By no means. Was he perfected by the laver (Baptism) alone, and sanctified by the descent of the Holy Spirit? So it is. The very same thing happens to us likewise, whose pattern our Lord was. Being baptized, (*i. e.* regenerated,) we are enlightened, being enlightened we are adopted, being adopted we are perfected, being perfected we are made immortal. He that is born again, and illuminated, (as the very term implies,) is immediately set free from darkness.”

Μήτι οὖν ὁμολογήσουσιν ἅκοντες τὸν Λόγον τέλειον ἐκ τελείου φύντα τοῦ Πατρὸς, κατὰ τὴν οἰκονομικὴν προδιατύπωσιν ἀναγεννηθῆναι τελείως; καὶ εἰ τέλειος ἦν, τί ἐβαπτίζετο ὁ τέλειος; ἔδει, φησὶ, πληρῶσαι τὸ ἐπάγγελμα τὸ ἀνθρώπινον· παγκαλῶς· φημὶ γάρ· ἅμα τοίνυν τῷ βαπτίζεσθαι αὐτὸν ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου γίνεται τέλειος; δῆλον ὅτι· οὐδὲν οὖν πρὸς αὐτοῦ προσέμαθεν; οὐ γάρ· τελειοῦται δὲ τῷ λουτρῷ μόνῳ, καὶ τοῦ Πνεύματος τῇ καθόδῳ ἀγιάζεται; οὕτως ἔχει. Τὸ δὲ αὐτὸ συμβαίνει τοῦτο καὶ περὶ ἡμᾶς ὧν γέγονεν ὑπογραφή ὁ Κύριος· βαπτιζόμενοι φωτιζόμεθα, φωτιζόμενοι νιοποιούμεθα, νιοποιούμενοι τελειούμεθα, τελειούμενοι ἀποθανατιζόμεθα.

He afterwards dwells upon this topic at some length, and expresses his opinion upon it in the words quoted by Mr. Faber, and cited by me as above.

"Οτι ἔῃ ἡ γινῶσις συνανατέλλει τῷ φωτίσματι, περιαστράπτουσα τὸν νοῦν, καὶ εὐθέως ἀκούομεν μαθηταὶ οἱ ἀμαθεῖς· πότερόν ποτε τῆς μαθήσεως ἐκείνης προσγενομένης; οὐ γὰρ ἂν ἔχοις εἰπεῖν τὸν χρόνον· ἡ μὲν γὰρ κατήχσεις εἰς πίστιν περιάγει· πίστις δὲ ἅμα βαπτίσματι ἀγίῳ παιδεύεται Πνεύματι.—*Clementis Alex. Pæd.* l. i. c. 6.

[G.]

"Ἄλλως τε, εἰ τῶν μετὰ τὸ λουτρὸν ἁμαρτανόντων χάριν εἶρηται τοῦτο τὸ ῥητόν, καὶ τοῦτοις ἀσύγνωστός ἐστιν ἡ τῶν πλημμελημάτων δίκη, πῶς τῷ μὲν ἐν Κορίνθῳ μετανοοῦντι κυροῖ τὴν αὐτὴν ἀγάπην ὁ Ἀπόστολος, τοὺς δὲ Γαλάτας παλινδρομήσαντας ὠδίνει, ἄχρις οὗ πάλιν μορφωθῇ Χριστὸς ἐν αὐτοῖς; ἐν δὲ τῷ λέγειν πάλιν, δείκνυσιν αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν προτέραν ἐν τῷ Πνεύματι τελειότητα. Τί δὲ καὶ Ναυάτῳ μεμφόμεθα ἀναιροῦντι μετάνοιαν, καὶ φάσκοντι μηδεμίαν συγγνώμην ἔχειν τοὺς μετὰ τὸ λουτρὸν ἁμαρτάνοντας, εἰ διὰ τοὺς μετὰ τὸ λουτρὸν ἁμαρτάνοντας εἶρηται τὸ ῥητόν; Καὶ γὰρ τὸ ἐν τῇ πρὸς Ἑβραίους εἰρημένον, οὐκ ἐκκληϊόν ἐστι τῶν ἁμαρτανόντων τὴν μετάνοιαν, ἀλλὰ δείκνυσιν ἔν ἐῖναι τὸ τῆς Καθολικῆς Ἐκκλησίας βάπτισμα, καὶ μὴ δευτέρον. Ἑβραίοις γὰρ ἔγραφε· καὶ ἵνα μὴ νομίζωσι πρὸς τὴν ἐν τῷ νόμῳ συνήθειαν προφάσει μετανοίας εἶναι πολλὰ καὶ καθ' ἡμέραν βαπτίσματα, διὰ τοῦτο μετανοεῖν μὲν παραινεῖ, μίαν δὲ εἶναι τὴν ἀνακαινίσιν διὰ τοῦ βαπτίσματος καὶ μὴ δευτέραν ἀναφαίνεται· ὥς καὶ ἐν ἐτέρᾳ ἐπιστολῇ φησι· μία πίστις, ἐν βάπτισμα. Οὐδὲ γὰρ εἶπεν, ἀδύνατον μετανοεῖν, ἀλλὰ ἀδύνατον προφάσει μετανοίας ἀνακαινίζειν ἡμᾶς· ἔχει δὲ πολλὴν τὴν διαφορὰν· ὁ μὲν γὰρ μετανοῶν παύεται μὲν τοῦ ἁμαρτάνειν, ἔχει δὲ τῶν τραυμάτων τὰς οὐλὰς· ὁ δὲ βαπτιζόμενος τὸν μὲν παλαιὸν ἀποδιόσκει· ἀνακαινίζεται δὲ ἄνωθεν γεννηθεὶς τῇ τοῦ Πνεύματος χάριτι.—*Athanasius, Epistola iv. ad Serapionem*, 13.

[H.]

Πηγὴ τοίνυν καὶ φῶς λέγεται ὁ Πατὴρ—λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὁ Υἱὸς ὡς μὲν πρὸς τὴν πηγὴν ποταμός—πρὸς δὲ τὸ φῶς ἀπαύγασμα—τοῦ τοίνυν Πατρὸς φωτὸς ὄντος, τοῦ δὲ Υἱοῦ καταυγάσματος· τὰ γὰρ περὶ τούτων μάλιστα οὐκ ὀκνητέον λέγειν πολλάκις· ἔξεστιν ὁρᾶν καὶ ἐν τῷ Υἱῷ τὸ Πνεῦμα ἐν ᾧ φωτιζόμεθα· τῷ δὲ Πνεύματι φωτιζομένων ἡμῶν, ὁ Χριστὸς ἐστιν ὁ ἐν αὐτῷ φωτίζων· πάλιν τε τοῦ Πατρὸς ὄντος

πηγῆς, τοῦ δὲ Υἱοῦ ποταμοῦ λεγομένου, πίνειν λεγόμεθα τὸ Πνεῦμα—
τὸ δὲ Πνεῦμα ποτιζόμενοι τὸν Χριστὸν πίνομεν,—καὶ πάλιν τοῦ
Χριστοῦ ὄντος ἀληθινοῦ Υἱοῦ, ἡμεῖς τὸ Πνεῦμα λαμβάνοντες νιο-
ποιούμεθα, — νιοποιούμενοι δὲ τῷ Πνεύματι, ὁῦλον ὅτι ἐν τῷ
Χριστῷ χρηματίζομεν τέκνα Θεοῦ.—*Athanasius, Epistola prima
ad Serapionem*, 18.

[I.]

Αὕτη δὲ τοῦ Θεοῦ φιλανθρωπία ἐστίν, ὅτι ὧν ἐστὶ ποιητῆς, τούτων
καὶ Πατὴρ κατὰ χάριν ὑστερον γίνεται· γίνεται δὲ ὅταν οἱ κτισθέντες
ἄνθρωποι, ὡς εἶπεν ὁ Ἀπόστολος, λάβωσιν εἰς τὰς καρδίας ἐαυτῶν
τὸ Πνεῦμα τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ κράζον, Ἀββᾶ ὁ Πατήρ. Οὗτοι δὲ εἰσιν,
ὅσοι δεξάμενοι τὸν Λόγον ἔλαβον ἐξουσίαν παρ' αὐτοῦ τέκνα Θεοῦ
γενέσθαι· ἄλλως γὰρ οὐκ ἂν γένοιτο υἱοὶ, ὄντες φύσει κτίσματα, εἰ
μὴ τοῦ ὄντος φύσει καὶ ἀληθινοῦ Υἱοῦ τὸ Πνεῦμα ὑποδέξωνται.—
Athanasius, contra Arianos, Oratio ii. 59.

[K.]

Mr. Faber and myself have more than on one occasion quoted
the same passages from the writings of the fathers, in order to
establish widely different conclusions. Mr. Faber, for instance,
has quoted a passage from St. Augustine⁷, with a view of showing
that, in the opinion of that eminent father, Regeneration and the
conversion of the heart, are identical; which I had quoted many
years before, as an example of the very clear and decided manner
in which he distinguishes Regeneration from Conversion, &c.

The following is the passage:—

“As in Abraham the righteousness of faith preceded, and
Circumcision, the seal of the righteousness of faith, followed; and
in Cornelius, spiritual sanctification preceded in the gift of the
Holy Ghost, and the sacrament of Regeneration followed in the
washing, or laver, of Baptism. And as in Isaac, who was circum-
cised on the eighth day after his birth, Circumcision, the seal of the
righteousness of faith preceded, and since he imitated his father's
faith, that righteousness, the seal of which had preceded in the
infant, followed as he grew up: so likewise in infants who are
baptized, the sacrament of Regeneration precedes; and, if they

⁷ Augustine de Bapt. contra Donat. l. iv. c. 24.

hold fast their Christian piety, that conversion in the heart follows, the sign of which had gone before in the body. By all of which things, it is manifest that the sacrament of Baptism is one thing, and the Conversion of the heart another: but that the salvation of men is completed by both^a."

This appeared to me to be a direct example of the manner in which the fathers distinguished between Regeneration and Conversion, &c.; *i. e.* according to Waterland's division between Regeneration and Renovation; the sacrament of Baptism and the sacrament of Regeneration being in the language of Augustine synonymous terms. Mr. Faber, however, maintains that Regeneration and the Conversion of the heart are identical; and that, therefore, the distinction made by Augustine is not between Regeneration and Conversion, but between the sacrament of Baptism and spiritual Regeneration. Having given my opinion on this subject in the preceding work, I leave this question to be decided by those who are acquainted with the language and sentiments of Augustine, without feeling any apprehension of an adverse decision.

But Mr. Faber does not appear to have observed that this passage of Augustine, according to his interpretation of it, proves too much,—more (*i. e.*) than suits Mr. Faber's purpose. For Mr. Faber does not deny that infants may be regenerated in Baptism, being duly qualified by a *prevenient act*; and contends that the fact of their being regenerated must be determined by the evidence of experience. But if in Augustine's language the conversion of the heart and Regeneration are identical; his doctrine must be that infants are never regenerated in Baptism. For he does not affirm that the conversion of the heart (which does not here signify turning from sin, but a right state of heart towards God) sometimes accompanies, and sometimes follows Infant Baptism, but that it never accompanies it. Consequently, if by Conversion of the heart, he means Regeneration, he must have believed that Regeneration never accompanies Infant Baptism.

But since Augustine has constantly asserted that Regeneration

^a See Treatise, c. ii.

does accompany Infant Baptism, it follows by necessary consequence, (unless we suppose that he has contradicted himself,) that he did make that distinction, which this passage, if allowed to speak for itself, evidently establishes between Regeneration and the Conversion of the heart.

[L.]

Generic language.

Mr. Faber is fond of unusual and uncouth words, to which, I suspect, he does not always assign a definite and distinct meaning. He has here adopted the word *generic*, which he employs in a sense foreign from its real signification. By *generic language* he appears to mean such as may be applied, in a loose and popular way, to a genus, or class, or community, but cannot be applied to all the individuals comprised in them. In this sense, he considers *generic* to be *opposed to specific language*. But this sense of the word is very different from its proper and really technical meaning.

“A Generic or Generical name in natural history, is the word used to signify all the species of actual bodies, which agree in certain essential and peculiar characters, and therefore all of the same family or kind; so that the word used as the generical name equally expresses every one of them; and some other words equally expressive of the peculiar qualities or figures of each, are added, in order to denote them singly, and make up what is called the specific name⁹!”

The words *generic* and *generical* seem to have been coined by natural historians for the purpose of avoiding the ambiguities of the more usual word, *general*. That language is *generic*, which defines or describes the genus, to the exclusion of those differences which distinguish, one from another, the several species and individuals comprised in it. But whatever is predicated of a genus, may be predicated of all the species and individuals which belong to it. In other words, generic language necessarily extends and applies to every species and every individual in-

⁹ Encyclopædia Britannica.

cluded in the genus; while specific language distinguishes, one from another, the several species, and, subordinately, the individuals comprised in it. But since every species is said to contain the genus; because the definition or description of the genus is included in, and forms part of that of the species; *specific* language is not *opposed to generic*, but adds something to it, and what is true or certain *generically*, cannot be false or doubtful *specifically*.

But if the word *generic*, as adopted by Mr. Faber, has any meaning, it is synonymous with *general* in its loose and popular sense; and with him *generic language* is that which expresses what may be affirmed, *in the long run, usually, commonly, often, not unfrequently*, or what may be affirmed of a multitude of persons considered collectively, but cannot be affirmed, with any certainty, of the individuals of which it consists.

Mr. Faber, however, seems to disclaim this interpretation of the word, and to have persuaded himself that it has some very precise and stringent meaning, in his own vocabulary. For in his comment on the statement of the Catechism, that Christ has "ordained two sacraments only, as *generally* necessary to salvation," he tells us that the word *generally* does not mean *plerumque*, "for the most part, usually, commonly," &c., but *generically as opposed to specifically*.

What Mr. Faber here means by these sacraments being necessary to salvation *generically, but not specifically*, after this comment, I will not attempt to conjecture. But I agree with him, that the word *generally* in this place is not used in the popular sense of *plerumque*, "for the most part," &c. ; but in its more strict and proper signification.

For the meaning of this answer is, that though there may be other ordinances which have been called sacraments, and have somewhat of a sacramental character, though some of these may be necessary to the salvation of particular persons, under particular circumstances, there are only two sacraments ordained by Christ in his Church, as *generally necessary to salvation*; *i. e. always, universally*, to the salvation of all persons. For the exceptions which have been already noticed, are not, properly

speaking, *à priori* limitations of the doctrine, or the rule of duty, but exceptions made *à posteriori*, by natural equity and Christian charity, in behalf of persons who have been prevented from receiving these sacraments by circumstances over which they had no control, where the will was ready, but the opportunity was wanting.

What is false or doubtful specifically cannot be true generally.

Mr. Faber asserts that the Church pronounces the baptized person regenerate *generically*, but not *specifically*. Taking these words in their appropriate and technical sense, the assertion is absurd and impossible ; for if the baptized person is regenerate generically, he must of necessity be regenerate specifically. But if we use the words in the loose and inaccurate sense which Mr. Faber evidently assigns to them, the fact is directly contradictory of his assertion. For the Church in her declaration applies the general rule or general truth to the particular case of the individual to whom she is administering this sacrament. Nothing can be conceived less liable to the charge of vagueness and *generality*, (properly speaking,) nothing can be more precise and particular, than her language.

THE END.



1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14







